

tion to this. This is also evidence which is furnished by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce in the report to which I have just referred. On page 38 of that report there is printed an article—evidently which they approve—in which the fact is clearly and emphatically stated that every available vessel than can be operated in this trade is engaged in it at present, and that every shipyard which is capable of constructing ships is busy constructing ships.

In every direction it will be seen that huge profits are to be made in the shipping industry. Nor are shipowners the only ones to feel the boom. The prosperity has created a demand for more ships. The price of steamers is rising daily, and shipbuilders are booking so many orders that their yards will be full for some years to come. Many shipowners also are selling off their old tonnage at prices which they never dreamed of before the outbreak of war.

Investigation goes to show that the present boom has been of a much greater nature than during other wars. After the Franco-Prussian War, for instance, the boom did not set in until some 12 months after the declaration of peace. By this time the nations had time to turn around, and finance was readjusted. And then the rise in freights was more gradual. It was not until 1882 that the top of the rise appeared.

It is interesting to note that the only rate approximating to present figures was paid to the *Ben Nevis*, a steamer with a carrying capacity of 7,500 quarters, or about 1,500 tons, which obtained 8s. 3d. per quarter from New Orleans to Rouen.

The shipment of wheat commences from the end of December, however, and already many vessels have been chartered, the rates of freight for steamers which will be ready to load in January and early February rising within the last month or two from 20s. per ton to 37s. 6d.

The beginning of the season has not seen a large number of steamers chartered to Italy, but it is now stated that, in addition to the enormous quantities which are being imported from North America, the Italian Government has purchased some 400,000 tons of wheat and oats from the Argentine Republic for shipment from the River Plata.

I read that for the purpose of demonstrating, by the testimony of the proponents of this bill themselves, that every available ship is engaged in this trade, and that even if the Government can purchase them, they can not carry any more freight than they are carrying now; and as for the relief which could be experienced in freight rates by the operation of the small number of ships which the Government would acquire under this bill, even if it operates them in the European trade, it would be impossible for them to take care of more than a small portion of the enormous shipments which these reports indicate are now being made to Europe, and would have but a negligible effect upon rates.

The only remedy aside from building ships, Mr. President, is the purchase of these interned vessels. The result of that would be that vessels which have suffered the penalty of the superior navy of their adversaries and have been practically interned, which are forbidden from the sea, would be released; money would be spent in a foreign country for replacing them with other vessels, and the United States for its investment of thirty or forty million dollars would have a number of vessels rapidly growing obsolete, which it would be impossible for it to operate profitably in competition with more modern vessels equipped with new kinds of engines, Diesel engines, submerged flame combustion—internal combustion, as it is called—and all the improvements in the way of marine engines which are now being placed in vessels being constructed at the present time.

Mr. President, if we spend the amount of money provided in this bill it ought to be spent in this country. There never was a time in the history of the country when something that would afford occupation to the idle workmen of this country would be more opportune. Instead of undertaking to release the bound-up ships of a belligerent nation a bill should be passed, if we decide to embark upon this policy, which would restore the hum of industry to American shipyards and give some occupation to the navy yards of the United States, now being maintained at a great expense without any corresponding results.

However desirous we might be that the Government of the United States should build up an auxiliary fleet or should engage in the shipping business, I submit that it would be folly to undertake, as is proposed here, and insistently proposed, when we acquire the ships, to operate them in the midst of a flagrant war, when everybody knows that the destruction of one of them, even though covered by the thin subterfuge of a private corporation which is owned by the Government, would create a feeling in this country that would bring us perilously near the declaration of hostilities, either by our own or by some foreign Government.

I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add, in amendment No. 3, the following:

That the President is authorized and directed to expend a sum not exceeding \$50,000,000 for the construction of ships in American shipyards, preference being given to navy yards, and to operate said ships on such lines of trade, coastwise or foreign, as he may select, under such terms and regulations as he may determine: *Provided*, That such ships shall be constructed, as far as practicable, so as to be adapted for service both as naval auxiliaries and as merchant ships.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. FLETCHER. I move to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Upon that I ask for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is upon laying on the table the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on the motion of the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] to disagree to the amendments of the House and ask for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. RANDELL, Mr. MARTIN of Virginia, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. NELSON, Mr. BURTON, and Mr. CRAWFORD were appointed as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. Mr. President, I simply desire to give notice that in the morning, immediately after the completion of the morning business, I shall ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, February 19, 1915, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, February 18, 1915.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We bless Thee, Infinite Spirit, our heavenly Father, for the enthusiasm which fills the breast of the man of convictions and impels to action because he feels down deep in his heart that he is in consonance with the eternal laws which Thou hast ordained. To him we owe a debt of gratitude which can not be expunged. Science, literature, art, government, religion are his contributions to the world. Give to us, we pray Thee, convictions, that we may be lifted out of self by enthusiasm into the higher realms of thought and action, exemplified in the life, character, and precepts of the Jesus of Nazareth. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CORRECTION OF A PENSION BILL.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday morning the House agreed to a conference report on pension bill H. R. 20562. The Clerk overlooked amendment 36, and it was not included in the conference report. I ask unanimous consent that the House recede from its disagreement to amendment No. 36 and agree to the same.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that the House recede from its disagreement to amendment 36 to the bill H. R. 20562 and agree to the same. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. WEBB was recognized.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. I desire to make a motion to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider the pension appropriation bill, which it is necessary to pass. I ask the Chair to recognize me for that purpose.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that the Chair had recognized me before the parliamentary inquiry by the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BARTLETT. But I was on my feet and looking at the Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Well, a good many people look at the Speaker.

Mr. BARTLETT. Trying to catch the Speaker's eye.

The SPEAKER. The Chair had already recognized the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I ask the Chair to lay before the House the bill H. R. 17869, now on the Speaker's table.

The SPEAKER. If this is going to take any considerable length of time, the Chair will ask the gentleman to withhold it for the present.

Mr. BARTLETT. I understand that it will take some time.

Mr. MANN. It will take considerable time.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, under Rule XXIV is it not in order and have we not the right to have the Chair lay before the House bills on the Speaker's table?

The SPEAKER. There is no doubt about that, but the Chair has a supervisory power over the proceedings of the House.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, to save time I will raise the question of consideration on the bill called up by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina can call his bill up to-morrow morning.

Mr. WEBB. Can I not call it up this afternoon immediately after the passage of the pension bill?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can call it up as soon as we get through with the pension bill.

Mr. WEBB. Then I withdraw my request.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 19545. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war; and

H. R. 19376. An act confirming patents heretofore issued to certain Indians in the State of Washington.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled joint resolution of the following title:

S. J. Res. 187. Joint resolution requesting the President of the United States to invite foreign Governments to participate in the International Congress on Education.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the pension appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. CLINE in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the pension appropriation bill, of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 21161) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the consumption of time in general debate, how much has been used on both sides?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has had 1 hour and 15 minutes and the gentleman from Illinois has occupied 35 minutes.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWITZER].

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration carries appropriations to meet our obligations growing out of the administration of the pension laws which have been enacted on account of services rendered in the Army and the Navy in the defense of our country, and I know of no appropriation made by Congress to which the people give a more cheerful assent.

I recall with pride that my first effort on the floor of this Chamber was in support of the passage of the Sherwood pension bill which as amended and finally enacted by Congress carried an increase of pensions to more than 400,000 Civil War veterans. I was among the first of those to advocate eliminat-

ing from the original Sherwood bill those provisions which excluded from its benefits veteran inmates of soldiers' homes and those veterans who were recipients of an annual income of a thousand dollars or more. The increases carried by this bill were in no instance unreasonable, and in the amount they no more than equaled the increase in cost of living since the passage of the dependent bill of 1890 and the subsequent old-age pension bill.

Since the Sherwood law has been passed more than 100,000 Civil War veterans have died. The grim reaper is fast depleting their ranks, and of the 35,000 who die annually thousands of them leave widows who under the existing laws are entitled to draw a \$12 monthly stipend. Many other thousands have been found to be so necessitous and with claims so meritorious that they have been granted pensions by special acts of Congress. But there are other thousands who are just as necessitous, whose claims are as meritorious, who are heartlessly refused any relief by this great Government.

On the 7th day of last December I introduced into this House a bill to remove from existing law that limitation which excludes widows whose marriages to the old soldiers date subsequent to June 27, 1890. Since I introduced that bill I have learned that on the 23d of May last the Senate Committee on Pensions recommended for passage and reported out the Spanish-American War widows' bill, which was passed by this House more than a year ago, with an amendment eliminating the limitation to which I have just referred, and to bring the bar down to a date which will correspond to the time of the passage of the proposed amendatory legislation. Anyone who has made a casual investigation of our pension laws will readily concede the justice of the amendment proposed by the Senate Committee on Pensions. I have been informed that if it is allowed to be brought to a vote at this session of Congress it will pass the Senate by an overwhelming majority; but will it be allowed to come to a vote? The Department of the Interior has estimated that the passage of the proposed legislation to which I have just referred will necessitate an annual increase of appropriations for the next few years of \$7,500,000, two million and a half of which will be needed on account of the deceased Spanish-American War veterans and \$5,000,000 on account of the deceased Civil War veterans. Twenty-four years after the close of the Civil War, at a time when we numbered only about 63,000,000 people, when our estimated wealth was only about \$62,000,000,000, Congress, recognizing the great hardships imposed upon widows to be compelled to prove that the death of the old soldier was caused by some disease or injury contracted or incurred in the service and desiring to treat them more liberally, inserted in the dependent act of 1890 a provision giving a pension of \$8 a month regardless of the cause of death. The amount has since been increased to \$12 per month.

In order to remove the incentive to marry an old soldier, sick and decrepit, whose time on earth in all probability would be short, for the purpose of securing a widow's pension, the Congress included among its beneficiaries only those widows who married the soldier prior to June 27, 1890. Twenty-four more years have now rolled around, and it seems to me to be unjust, and it certainly is unjust, that the widow who married the old soldier a few days or a few months or a few years prior to June 27, 1890, should now be entitled to a pension, while the widow who married the old soldier a few days subsequent to that time has no pensionable status under the law. One was as much the wife of the soldier as the other; one is as much the widow of the soldier as the other and just as much entitled to a pension as the other. It seems to me that 24 years is too long a time to allow such a gross inequality to remain in any pension law, especially a pension law for a great Nation like this, comprised of 100,000,000 people, whose wealth to-day is estimated at twice what it was at the time of the passage of the dependent act in 1890.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWITZER. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman will find, if he was here the other day, when we passed—

Mr. SWITZER. I can not yield for a speech.

Mr. BARTLETT. I will give the gentleman the additional time. If the gentleman was here the other day, he will remember that the Pension Committee reported out at least a half dozen bills where the widow had married the soldier some time after that time and a pension was granted. I call attention to that fact because one of the very few cases I have was one of those, and I had not been able to get it considered.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, I think I have just stated that Congress found many cases of old widows who were not

entitled to a pension under the general law whose cases were so necessitous and meritorious that they have been given pensions by special act of Congress; but there are other thousands that are unprovided for, and it will be an utter impossibility to grant special acts for all of them.

There are thousands of widows who are to-day drawing pensions who lived with old soldiers as their wives a much shorter time than thousands of those who married the soldier since 1890. Can anybody give any valid reason why this outrageous discrimination should continue against the widow who lived as the wife of the old soldier for 5, 10, 15, or 20 years since 1890? I know that many will say that this is an inopportune time to press legislation which will necessitate an increase of appropriations to some extent for the next few years; but, with a deficit confronting us in our national revenues, this Congress has enacted a war tax to help build railroads in Alaska, and only yesterday this House voted to issue and sell millions of dollars of bonds to enable the Government to go into the shipping business—to go, you might say, buccaneering upon the high seas in quest of foreign trade—to make conquest of the marts of the world.

If we must contribute to a war-tax fund, I submit that the widows and the dependents of those who have defended the country in time of war ought to be allowed to share in the benefits of that fund, and I think that seven and a half millions of dollars is a reasonable demand for such purpose out of \$100,000,000 of war-tax revenue. Of course, we have been told that this matter ought to go over until next winter, but we are informed through the newspapers that this administration proposes to follow "the watchful-waiting policy" in looking after and caring for the deficit which now confronts us, and with an \$80,000,000 deficit on top of a war tax next December, and with \$48,000,000 of sugar revenue disappearing May 1 following on account of the automatic workings of the iniquitous Underwood tariff law, the same argument that is advanced to-day for postponing this legislation will again be advanced, and it will be accentuated one-hundredfold on account of the conditions to which I have just alluded.

Mr. Chairman, are we to go to the country at the close of this Congress with the proposition that there is no hope during this administration for any legislative relief for the unfortunate widows to whom I have just alluded? It will not do to say that there is no sentiment in this country for this legislation. The Civil War veterans throughout the whole Nation demand it. The Spanish-American War veterans demand it, and the Senate in the closing hours of the last Congress passed a bill, practically the same bill that the Senate committee reported out on the 23d day of May last. The President prevailed upon this House a day or two ago to pass a shipping bill for the moral effect it might have on the legislative body at the other end of the Capitol. It seems to me that it would be wisdom for the Committee on Invalid Pensions to consider my bill and report it out, or some similar measure, and secure its passage through this House in order to wake up the slumbering bill which the Senate committee reported out last spring.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWITZER. I will.

Mr. GOULDEN. I desire to ask the gentleman if he is familiar with what changes or amendments were made in the Senate with regard to the bill they have just reported out with reference to Spanish-American War widows?

Mr. SWITZER. I do not know that I can accurately answer the gentleman; but I think they reported out practically the same bill that was passed by the House. The only difference is that they have recommended an amendment to that bill which takes care of the trouble of which I have just been complaining by giving pensions to widows of Civil War veterans who married soldiers since June 27, 1890, and bringing the bar down to date of the passage of this proposed legislation.

Mr. GOULDEN. I think I agree with the gentleman in the main, but I question whether we would want to bring it down quite as far as that. Perhaps, in common justice, if we should bring it down 10 years it would be about right; say 1900, as many needy and deserving widows of veterans of the Civil War who married the soldier after 1890 are entitled to this recognition.

Mr. SWITZER. There is an honest difference of opinion upon that proposition, but I think at least it ought to be brought down to 1910. I feel confident that the Committee on Invalid Pensions of the House favors some relief of this kind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARTLETT. I will yield the gentleman five minutes, having occupied a portion of his time.

Mr. SWITZER. I will take just a moment more. Of course there is great pressure brought upon the members of the In-

valid Pensions Committee by the leaders of the majority to practice rigid economy at this time. They hesitate to act, but we know and the people of this country know that appropriations are being made every day which the revenues of the next fiscal year will be unable to meet, and they know we propose some time in the future to either correct the blunders and mistakes made in the recent revision of the tariff laws or increase some of the existing rates of taxation or develop and enact some new tax machinery to take care of these appropriations and these deficits that we are making at this time. It seems to me it would be the part of patriotism, that it is our duty, to include that small increase of appropriation of seven and a half million dollars, although to some extent enlarging the deficits we know will be on hand at the convening of the next session of Congress. [Applause.]

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back three minutes.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND].

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. Mr. Chairman, I was very glad of the opportunity on Monday of this week to cast my vote during the numerous roll calls in favor of the bill (H. R. 12202) to prevent interstate commerce in the products of child labor. Owing to the lateness of the hour when the bill was taken up, and due to the filibuster attempted by certain southern Democrats bitterly opposed to the legislation, practically all discussion upon this important bill was cut off in the House.

I avail myself of the present opportunity, therefore, to briefly discuss this important measure, which is now pending in the Senate, where I sincerely hope it may not be lost sight of because of present chaotic conditions in that body.

Briefly, the bill provides in section 1 that it shall be unlawful to ship in interstate commerce the products of a mine or quarry which have been produced by the labor of children under 16 years of age, or the products of any mill, cannery, factory, or like establishment produced by children under 14 years of age. Products are also prohibited shipment from establishments where children work more than eight hours a day or more than six days a week, or after 7 p. m. or before 7 a. m.

Section 2 designates the Attorney General, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Commerce as a board to enforce and carry out this law.

Section 3 empowers the Secretary of Labor or any person designated by him to enter and investigate any establishment that produces or manufactures goods for interstate commerce.

Section 4 makes it the duty of any district attorney upon proper reference of violation of the act to prosecute in the Federal courts the violator.

Section 5 provides the penalty for violation of the act. The maximum fine is \$1,000, the minimum \$100, with an additional provision of from one year to one month's imprisonment or both fine and imprisonment, at the discretion of the court.

This section also contains a provision absolving a dealer from prosecution if the dealer can establish a guaranty from the producer or manufacturer that the provisions of this act in regard to age and hours of employees was not violated. This guaranty shall be void unless containing the name and address of the person giving the same. In the event of violation of the guaranty the person giving it is subject to prosecution and penalties.

Section 6 provides that each shipment or delivery for shipment shall constitute a separate offense.

Section 7 provides that the act shall become operative one year from its passage.

Within continental United States in 1900, according to the census of that year, 1,750,178 children between the ages of 10 and 15 years were engaged in gainful occupations. Of this number 142,105 were only 10 years of age, 158,778 were 11, 221,313 were 12, 268,427 were 13, 406,701 were 14, and 552,854 had reached the age of 15 years. This was over 18.2 per cent of all the children in the United States between the ages of 10 and 15 years.

The census of 1910 shows a slight increase in the number of children employed at the ages mentioned—a total of 1,990,225. This is 18.4 per cent of the children of corresponding age, as against 18.2 per cent for 1900, 10 years previously. It is an encouraging sign, and no doubt an evidence of the activities of those engaged in the work of eradicating this evil, that the 1910 census figures show a marked decrease—18.8 per cent—in the number of children of both sexes between the ages of 10 and 15 years employed in nonagricultural pursuits—occupations most harmful to those of tender age.

It is to be regretted, however, that thousands of children are yet employed in coal mines, in poorly ventilated cotton, silk, and other textile mills. Many toil in the sweatshops of the

great cities, in glass factories at night, and in cigar and cigarette factories. The injurious effect of this labor upon the health of children, particularly during the adolescent period, is recognized by those who have made a scientific study of the subject.

While it is recognized that many States have passed child-labor laws, many of them effective, the enactment of a national statute upon the subject is certain to bring about a greater uniformity. It is also recognized that in certain States where the evil is most pronounced no action has been taken.

Opposition is frequently encountered to State legislation from manufacturers who contend that if they are compelled to discontinue the employment of children while their competitors in neighboring States continue to enjoy the benefits of this cheaper labor, the result will prove financially disastrous. This but strengthens the argument for a national attack upon the evil.

In Mississippi over 63 per cent of boys between the ages of 10 and 15 years are employed in gainful occupations according to census bulletins, and over 43 per cent of the girls. In Alabama, North and South Carolina the percentage is about as high.

For many years Congress has been discussing this important subject. It strikes me that the time has come to act. We have passed legislation in this body within recent years to conserve our national forests, to protect the coal of Alaska, to preserve animal life, and to safeguard the scenic wonder spots of the Nation. Shall we longer permit commercial greed to prevent the conservation of our children—the boys and girls who must face and solve the great problems of to-morrow?

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] 10 minutes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California has just given an illustration of unfair competition in business—the use of child labor by some manufacturers when other manufacturers, more scrupulous, will not resort to such methods. Unfair competition is the greatest curse to American business to-day. It means the law of the jungle, under which the strong and cunning and unscrupulous always overpower the weak. Because of that fact, unfair competition carried to its logical end advances concentration of wealth, control by the few, and monopoly.

One of the most dangerous methods of unfair competition is the price cutting of standard, trade-marked goods, which have in them the reputation of the maker and his purpose to make them products which will secure and retain the confidence of the buying public.

I am in favor of the doctrine that a manufacturer who has distinctly identified his product and fixed its value in the public mind should have the right to protect the sale of his merchandise, the good will of his trade, and the good name of his product by fixing the retail selling price of that product. I contend that the maintenance of the retail price is a necessary and legitimate business principle, that it means benefit to all and works injury to none.

This right of price maintenance for specialties and branded articles was recognized as a legal one until a few years ago. Recently, however, successive decisions of the United States Supreme Court have taken that right from the manufacturer, and an entirely new situation confronts business as a result of these judicial decisions.

For many years the decisions of the Supreme Court held to the general principle that a manufacturer could sell or refuse to sell his goods, as he saw fit. Then the tenor changed, and now the court has practically reversed its decisions and takes the opposite view.

The first case that ended in a decision questioning the right of the manufacturer to fix the resale price was that of the Bobbs-Merrill Publishing Co. against the R. H. Macy Co. of New York.

The Bobbs-Merrill Co. published a copyrighted book which was marked to sell at \$1. The Macy company cut the price, and the publishing company brought suit for an infringement of copyright, on the ground that it had the right to fix the selling price.

The Supreme Court held that as Macy & Co. had made no express contract to sell the book for \$1, it was not bound to maintain the price. The case was decided upon the facts, and thus did not touch on the question of previous agreement or the rights of manufacturers of patented articles. It was important, however, in that it showed the trend of mind of the court, which was followed out in later decisions.

The next case was that of the Miles Medical Co., which sought to maintain the retail prices of its proprietary medi-

cines. The court decided that when a manufacturer sold his goods he parted with all his property rights and could not control the resale price. It was further held that such fixation of price was in violation of the Sherman antitrust law.

Still this case did not touch the question of patented articles, but the rights of the patentee was the question at issue in the next case, that of Henry versus the A. D. Dick Co.

The court upheld the agreement in this case, but Justice White dissented in a minority opinion—and this minority opinion became the majority opinion in the next case decided. This was the case familiarly known as the Sanatogen case, and the decision in it held the opposite view from that in the Dick case. The change of a single vote in the Supreme Court made the doctrine of price maintenance and contracts for price maintenance illegal and in violation of the Sherman antitrust law.

The Waltham Watch Co. case followed, and the court repeated its decision that the patentee, while he might create selling agencies to control the price, could not fix the price after outright sale to the dealer.

This was the last case decided and finished the series of decisions in which the Supreme Court has completely changed its former attitude, and now holds that contracts for the maintenance of the price of copyrighted or patented articles are illegal, contrary to public policy, and void under the antitrust law.

The court makes three exceptions in its decisions, and declares that manufacturers can maintain prices, first, by establishing selling agencies dealing directly with the ultimate consumer; second, by reserving a substantial royalty from the retail price; third, by selling direct from the plant through personal application or mail orders.

That is the situation as it stands at present. Because of this judge-made law, made in some instances by one man only, manufacturers face entirely new and wholly unjust conditions in the transaction of business. Uncle Sam makes it a crime for anyone to sell a postage stamp at less than its face value. Price cutting on his brands is prohibited, but price-cutting dealers are permitted and encouraged to depreciate the value of the goods of independent manufacturers without let or hindrance.

To remedy the injustices involved in this situation, an act of Congress is necessary, and such a measure, known as the Stevens bill, is pending in this Congress. It provides that maintenance of price shall be legal, provided that the producer does not have a monopoly of a general class of merchandise and is not a party to a combination for the purpose of securing such a monopoly. It provides that the price must be printed on a notice affixed to each article and that the producer must file with the Bureau of Corporations a statement giving the brand, trade-mark, and so forth, and the uniform price to wholesalers, retailers, and consumers. Articles may be sold for less than the uniform price when a dealer retires from business or becomes bankrupt, or if the goods are damaged or soiled. In such cases, however, the dealer must offer the manufacturer or vendor the opportunity of purchasing the articles at the price paid for them.

I submit that this measure should be passed. I believe that the right to fix the retail prices of standard brands of merchandise of fixed quality is a benefit to the manufacturer, dealer, and consumer.

It will protect the manufacturer from unfair competition, and will prevent trade pirates from ruining his business.

The manufacturer produces a standard article and gives it a trade-mark or trade name. He spends his money to make that name mean quality to the public mind. He has a right to be protected after he has made that individual trade name valuable, for it is his property, and his alone. Under the law to-day he may collect damages from those who steal it from him and use it for themselves.

But the value of his trade-mark is not alone in the name or in its form or color or shape. It is more than a certain kind of box or label. It is a symbol to the public of a certain quality of goods and the character of the concern that makes them. Any practice, therefore, that injures the article in the public mind and damages the reputation of the firm is as unfair as the theft of a trade-mark itself. It should be equal ground for a suit for damages.

Mr. WEBB. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I will.

Mr. WEBB. Does the bill to which you refer apply only to trade-mark goods?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. It refers to all standard identified goods which are not monopolized, and its purposes are clearly expressed in the bill itself.

Mr. WEBB. That is, all goods that have been well advertised?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. All goods that have been identified by the manufacturer until they have a certain value in the public mind.

Mr. WEBB. Who is to decide that question?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The decision must be made, under this bill, by the manufacturer when he gives his trade-mark to the Bureau of Corporations, together with his uniform price to the wholesaler, retailer, and consumer.

The manufacturer of such an article must put real value into his goods and he must make the public want his article. He individualizes it and gives it a name to be known by. He must establish a general market and advertise constantly the merits of his goods. He advertises the price, for he must convince the public that it is worth the price asked and persuade the people to go to a store and pay that price.

This is the manufacturer's most valuable asset, and upon it depends his business. But after he has made his article mean a certain value and quality and has created a demand from the public the price cutter begins his attack. In fact, it is because of this value and this demand for a particular article that leads the price cutter to select it. The public knows the value of the article and may be fooled through a low price on it into buying articles of which they do not know the value. The manufacturer is penalized for having made a uniform, individualized, known value, and known quality product.

The price cutter takes this widely known article and reduces its price below cost. He does this, not for the purpose of selling more of them, for the fewer he sells the better he is satisfied and the less he loses. He wishes to attract customers on the strength of this bargain price so that he may sell other goods at a greater profit than that on the standard goods. He seeks to create the impression that all his goods are sold at prices proportionately as low as that on the article whose value is well known to the public.

Now, it is obvious that other dealers must meet this cut price if they are to continue on an equal plane with this competitor. They cut the price to an equal or lower figure, but at the same time they lose all desire to sell the article on which they are forced to lose money. That strikes a fatal blow at the manufacturer, for his market is destroyed and he is helpless to prevent it. Cheaper substitutes are sold instead of his article and dealers in time refuse to carry his goods at all. His advertising and his efforts in every way to make his trade-mark mean a certain price and a certain value are rendered useless through the practices of price-cutting trade pirates.

I consider that such unfair competition is as bad as outright theft of trade-marks and brands and should be as severely frowned upon by the law. It is a case of stealing a man's good name, which, as Shakespeare said, is worse than stealing his purse. The manufacturer's name must mean value or he can not build a permanently paying business. That value is an asset as valuable as his plant and merchandise. I contend that he has a right to ask and to receive protection from those who would rob him of this value. That protection can only come through the right to maintain a uniform selling price to the buyers of his product.

I believe in the referendum, in submitting matters of public welfare to the people and abiding by their decision. When a manufacturer refers his case directly to the people and gets a favorable vote from the people in their demand for his product, I believe he should have the benefit. If he does not get a favorable decision he goes out of business, and I am opposed to putting him out of business because he does get a favorable decision. And that is exactly what price cutting means to the manufacturer who has made a standard article and created a public demand for it.

But I go further than the manufacturer and contend that uniform selling prices of standard branded goods will benefit the retailer also.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I have only 10 minutes, but I will yield.

Mr. NORTON. Has the gentleman received very many demands from his constituents, outside of retailers, for this bill?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I have had demands from manufacturers, retailers, and consumers.

Mr. NORTON. Very many of them?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I have received demands from a number of consumers, and I will take that phase up in a moment. I believe it is as fair to the consumer as to the retailer and manufacturer. If it were against the consumer's interests I would not be for the proposition.

Mr. WEBB. Does the gentleman indorse the principles enunciated in the Dick against Henry case? Do you believe that

the patentee ought to go as far as that decision said he had a right to go?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I believe the patent question can be decided on another line entirely. If a manufacturer has a monopoly, this bill provides that the strong arm of the Government shall break the monopoly, for private monopoly and liberty can not live together. The argument that the gentleman refers to, and that is in his mind, is that this bill is favorable to monopoly. It is not a help to monopoly. It is a means of breaking monopoly, because price cutting, not price maintenance, leads to concentration of power, and power in the hands of a few, and monopoly.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I will.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Does the bill define a monopoly?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The bill goes to the Sherman antitrust law for the definition of monopoly, as I understand it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How is it to be ascertained as to how the goods shall go on the market under the monopoly clause of the bill?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Whenever a manufacturer or a combination of manufacturers has a substantial monopoly of a certain general class of merchandise, then of course that does not come within the scope of this bill, and the antitrust laws operate. But let me return to the retailer. Cutthroat competition never did and never will help the business of the average dealer.

I will admit that this may not hold good as regards mail-order houses, department stores, and so forth, because their interests seem to lie in the direction of putting the little merchant out of business and taking his trade. I am not anxious to help them do that and I am willing to let them take care of themselves, and without doubt they are perfectly able to do it. I take my stand on the side of the little corner store against the great combinations that threaten to wipe it out of existence. I stand with Littlefellow & Co. against the Soak-em-good mail-order houses. I consider the neighborhood store a necessity and I want it to have a fair chance, no more and no less, to grow greater and finer.

The large semimonopolistic retail establishments want the right to enforce cutthroat competition because they know that in such a jungle warfare the strong and cunning always triumph. Mr. Straus, of Macy & Co., when testifying before a congressional committee last year, was asked what would happen to the retailer of small financial ability if the consumers are led by cut prices to patronize large department stores and mail-order houses. He replied that the little retailer would either "wake up or go to sleep." He was right in the last phrase, for the little retailer would go to sleep permanently. He would be a victim of the knock-out drops of unfair competition. If he is not rich enough and powerful enough to compete on such an unfair basis with these gigantic combinations he must go out of business, and Mr. Straus and the others are in favor of putting him out and seeing that he never comes back.

Under fair conditions, however, the little retailer can compete with and outdistance the big mail-order houses. He can not do it on cut prices on standard goods, for the big establishments can lose money on a few articles and make it up on others in their large and varied stocks. They make it up, rest assured of that, for it costs them far more to do business than the little dealer, and the large dividends paid by the great mail-order houses show how profitable their dealings are in the aggregate.

It has been proven by sworn testimony that the big mail-order houses and department stores do business at a much greater cost than the small retailer. They have higher expenses and must make greater margins on goods sold. It follows that they can not afford to cut the cost of any article, and if they do they are compelled to make more than a fair profit on other goods sold. They use certain standard articles as "pullers-in" in order to tempt the people to buy unfamiliar and unnamed goods at unjust prices.

Prof. Neystrom, professor of economics in the University of Wisconsin, before the Judiciary Committee of the House on March 19, 1914, showed that the average cost of doing business to the small retailer is between 15 and 18 per cent; to the large mail-order houses it is from 27 to 30 per cent; and to large department stores 30 per cent and more.

These immense establishments must make a greater average profit than the small retailer, but they are able to destroy the market for the small dealer on every standard, trade-marked article on which they cut prices.

The history of the United Cigar Stores shows the effect of price cutting. In 1912, 1,252 cigar manufacturers went out of business, and in 1913, 716 cigar manufacturers went to the wall. All over the country, in every town and city invaded by these stores the retail tobacco dealer was ruined. In New York City 90 per cent of the retail dealers have been forced out of business by this combination. The small dealer must handle standard brands in order to satisfy his customers, but he can not afford to cut them below cost as do the United Cigar Stores. He can not carry the large stock of unknown brands on which to recoup his losses.

The same situation obtains in the drug business, the grocery business, and other lines. Half of the business of the smaller stores in these lines is in standard, trade-marked goods. If the market is destroyed by reckless price cutting, the little merchant must go out of business. He is between the devil and the deep sea. He can not meet the figures of the price cutter, and if he does not, he loses his customers.

Systematic price cutting was an invention of the Oil and Tobacco Trusts, which sold their products below cost in certain localities in order to crush competition. It is now being used by great mail-order houses and department stores to crush the small dealer. Public policy and the common good demand that this power be taken from them. It can only be done through the right of price maintenance, which will prevent the use of their unfair methods of competition.

Price maintenance does not mean less competition between retailers, it means less unfair competition. There is a competition in the quality of goods and in service just as much as in price. Retailers who sell the same goods from the same factories should not compete in prices. The competition should be between goods of the same class made in other factories.

That puts the competition on a fair basis, on price, quality, and service instead of solely on ability to stand losses until a competitor is driven out of business. It gives the retailer the reward of enterprise, efficiency, and honesty, instead of forcing him to descend to the level of trickery of trade pirates or go out of business.

The Stevens measure permits the retailer in case of clearance sales, retirement from business, bankruptcy, and so forth, to sell below the uniform price, provided he offers the goods to the manufacturer at the price paid for them. This permits the sale of damaged, soiled, or shopworn goods and protects both the manufacturer and the retailer at the same time.

But there is a still more important phase of this question. The maintenance of prices means benefit to the consumer. If it benefited the manufacturer and the dealer at the expense of the buyer, I should be opposed to it. The greatest good of the greatest number should be the sole purpose of legislation, and every American citizen is a consumer, while but a comparatively few are manufacturers and merchants.

But price cutting of standard articles, while ruinous to the maker and seller, never has been and never will be of permanent advantage to the buyer. In the end it adds to the cost of living and injures the entire body politic. It is a bad thing for America to have its labor or any part of its labor paid less than a fair wage. It is just as bad for America to have its business or any part of its business conducted at less than a fair profit.

When a purchaser goes into a store for goods, he desires to get the most value for his money with the expenditure of the least time and effort. The cut-price system is based on the old doctrine, "Let the buyer beware." It is a return to the old days when the purchaser was forced to make the rounds of the stores, compare the goods and the prices, and then, after finding the articles desired, haggle with the merchant until a price was agreed upon between them. That meant that the chances were all in favor of the consumer being cheated. He was dealing with a man who knew more than he did. The buyer could not possibly have the knowledge necessary to compare all kinds of unmarked merchandise and fix their value, and, as a result, swindling him was easy. Price tags meant nothing, and the entire matter of shopping was a lottery, pure and simple.

The introduction of standard, trade-marked articles, advertised and proven, changed the system of "Let the buyer beware" into one of "Protect the buyer."

When A. T. Stewart, three generations ago, revolutionized retail business by his one-price-in-plain-figures system, he took the first great step in that direction. With one stroke he abolished the system of haggling in his own store. He cut down the time required for shopping in his store and reduced the number of salesmen required, for the customers could see the prices for themselves. In this way he cheapened the cost of selling, re-

duced the price of goods, and made a tremendous success of his business.

But that only applied in one store. The system of standard, trade-marked goods sold in all stores at one price was a still greater step toward fairer and better merchandising. Under it the customer can go into any store at any time and be sure of securing exactly what he wants and at the same price always.

All fair-minded observers must admit that the practice of selling unnamed goods from bulk packages gives unnumbered opportunities for cheating customers. A committee investigating conditions in New York City found cheating rampant among stores selling goods to the poorer class of customers. They found that the same coffee from the same sack was sold at 25 and 37 cents a pound, and that the same tea from the same chest sold at from 35 to 70 cents a pound. This system may be carried on by dishonest dealers without fear of detection, for there is no way for the buyer to distinguish the goods from one day of purchase to the other.

Miss Laura A. Cauble, a social worker in New York, testifying before the Judiciary Committee of the House as to her work in connection with the distribution of a fund donated by a wealthy New York woman for the relief of some 8,000 families of New York poor, said:

The committee having the distribution of this fund found that it was spending an abnormal amount of money for the amount of nourishment the food we purchased contained, and an investigation was begun to determine how we could increase the purchasing efficiency of the money at our disposal.

I obtained samples of staple supplies at both small corner grocery stores and "chain stores" with a view to having them analyzed and obtaining bids on this basis from dealers.

We found three grades of tea—one at 40 cents, one at 60 cents, and one at 90 cents. Analysis demonstrated that all this tea came from the same chest, and the bid we received on this grade of tea was 22 cents a pound. Coffee, we found, was sold in the same way, and in the "chain stores" we found an average of 10.8 per cent short weight.

The larger stores, too, were cutting prices on standard goods, but their other supplies showed a general inferiority.

On the same blocks with these larger stores the small stores were being forced to cut on standard goods.

I investigated 526 small shops in one year, and during that time price cutting in the larger establishments either forced the sale or the failure of 116 of these smaller stores.

The consumer is protected by the system of standard, trade-marked, one-price, one-value goods. He tries the article and finds it to be satisfactory at the price asked. That gives him a standard with which to judge other articles in the same class, and he can be less easily cheated in the future.

He finds that he can go into any store and purchase the article without loss of time and be sure that he is getting exactly what he desires for his money. He finds that he can even telephone or send a child to the store and be sure that he will not be overcharged or get something different from what he desires.

If we were to go back to the old system of unidentified, unmarked goods, where every purchase is a gamble with the shopkeeper, the consumer would be hurt worst of all by such return.

Price cutting on standard articles means exactly that return in the last analysis. It means making a nation of deceitful bargainners, putting a premium on cheating practices, and placing a handicap on the honest dealer, while injuring the buyer from every angle. It forces the lowering of quality in all articles and the substitution of articles of a poorer grade for the standard articles driven from the market. The retailer must make a profit to stay in business; if he can not make it on some articles, he must increase his profits on others. The consumer must pay more for other articles when he purchases certain goods below cost. The Supreme Court of Washington stated that clearly, in a decision upholding price maintenance, when it said:

It is a fallacy to assume that the price cutter pockets this loss. The public makes it up on other purchases.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take up the thought of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WEBB], who seems to infer, judging by his questions, that this bill would give a monopoly privilege. Now, if that were true, we could not defend a bill like this; but it is not true.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there, just to make the question plain?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. WEBB. I cite the Dick case, where a man had a patent on an inking machine. It was contended that he could not use other ink, not patented, on that machine. I do not think the American people will stand for that sort of thing, because there you not only give a man a monopoly that his patent gives him,

but require something that amounts to a monopoly that his patent does not give him.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. That is what I had in mind. The fact that a manufacturer may have a patent monopoly is entirely aside from this proposition, because if there is a monopoly the law against restraint of trade applies and is clearly intended by this measure.

If price maintenance meant monopoly I should oppose it with every power I possess, for nothing harms the public like private monopoly, and the sooner its power to control markets and exploit the people through unbridled power is curbed the better it will be for the Nation.

But it is price cutting that means concentration of power and restraint of trade. It is more than that—it is a destroyer of trade. It gives the big combinations the power to drive small competitors out of business, and when they are destroyed the big establishments have the public at their mercy. Price cutting is the weapon of the seekers of monopoly in the retail trade of the country just as it was the weapon of the Oil and Tobacco Trusts in their efforts to crush out all competition.

Price maintenance will prevent unreasonable prices instead of making them more probable. Fair and honest competition between manufacturers of similar goods prevents any one of them from fixing and securing an unreasonable price. If he does fix an unreasonable price his competitor steps in and takes the business. Give us fair competition and we can safely allow the independent manufacturer to fix what price he will. There is all the difference in the world between controlling the market on all safety razors, for instance, and controlling the market on a single razor. If all the makers of razors should combine for the purpose of monopolizing the entire market they then should be dealt with by the strong arm of the Government, for no private monopoly can be tolerated safely in a free country.

But price maintenance has for its very purpose the prevention of restraints of trade and the practices which suppress competition and make monopoly possible. It is directly in line with the spirit of the Sherman antitrust law.

The trusts which do fix prices do not injure the public because they can fix prices, but because they have the power of monopoly to fix the price at an unjust figure. I am eternally opposed to the combinations of capital which are able to monopolize the market and fix the price they choose for their products; but I contend that the fixing of the retail price by independent manufacturers will prevent monopolies and chains of stores controlling ever wider fields of action.

The monopolist is not interested in a measure for price maintenance. The public needs his product and must come to him, and the merchant can go nowhere else. The manufacturer of unlimited capital is not interested in this measure, for he can establish a chain of stores across the country to handle his own goods and have the approval of the Government.

It is the independent manufacturer without a monopoly, without unlimited capital, but who has originality and enterprise and ability, who asks a square deal in business, and I believe he has a right not only to ask for it but to receive it.

The fight on this measure is clear-cut and distinct. The contending forces are price cutting and substitution on one side and on the other standard merchandise and the one-price system.

It is the same fight as was witnessed years ago over railroad rates. In the days of unfair and unrestricted competition in the railroad business there was a riot of dishonesty and carnival of corruption. Rebates, free passes, cut rates, and special privileges were the weapons used, and they built up a few monopolies on one hand while they crushed countless honest dealers and manufacturers on the other. Then the American Government stepped in and said that the rates should be the same to all, and fixed on a fair basis. No one to-day would wish to see a return to those piratical, jungle days of cut-throat competition, although there was bitter opposition at the time from the railroads, who were being ruined by the conditions.

I am for the one-price, square-deal-to-everybody system in merchandising. Not many decades ago a man could not sell his good will in business and agree to retire for a certain period. A famous English judge once declared that a certain man who sold his good will and agreed to stay out of business for six months was guilty of a restraint of trade and would be fined if brought into court.

To-day it is recognized that a man can sell his good will and that it is a recognized asset in his business. We will soon recognize, too, that there is such a thing as character in goods, expressed through an individual mark or brand, which means a certain value in the public mind. Justice demands that makers of these goods be given protection from unscrupulous trade pirates.

Fair play means fair trade. The fixed, uniform, and fair price to all is for the best interests of the buying public, the independent dealer, and the independent manufacturer. Congress should make every effort to end this unfair competition and assure a square deal to every party concerned in a merchandising transaction.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I can use some time on my side.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. I can use some here. I yield 30 minutes, Mr. Chairman, to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, during the consideration of the Post Office appropriation bill on December 31 I took occasion to discuss national finances and the growing deficit in the Treasury and to admonish the Democrats to cease from attributing the deficit to the European war. At that time I had before me the October summary of foreign commerce issued by the Department of Commerce, which gave the figures for the first 10 months of the calendar year 1914. I used unofficial figures for November and estimates for December in computing the imports and customs revenues for the year. I then pointed out that the falling off in customs revenue was in the main due to lower tariff and not to decrease of imports.

That was the statement made by the gentleman from Alabama in the closing debate on the conference report on the bill. That statement was based on the Treasury figures and the statement which he printed in the Record. So it was no guess. The Underwood law was intended to produce \$249,000,000 a year, or from \$70,000,000 to \$80,000,000 less than the old tariff act which it superseded. It is also pointed out that it came within about \$6,000,000 of doing so. In my former remarks I said that, estimating the imports for December at the same as they were in November, the total imports for 1914 would exceed by a few dollars the imports for the previous year. But the official figures now show that the falling off for December was more than was estimated, and that the total imports for 1914 were \$3,320,479 less than for the previous year.

In 1913 there were nine months of time under the Payne law and three months under the Underwood rates, so that we did not get the full benefit of the rates of the Payne law for the whole year, but we collected in 1913 \$310,551,961 in customs revenues, while in 1914, under the Underwood rates, we collected \$241,384,619, a falling off of \$69,167,342.

Now, I want you to note this particularly. In my former remarks I said that the actual receipts would fall but five or six million dollars below the \$249,000,000 estimated by Mr. Underwood for the fiscal year 1915. They actually fell off \$7,000,000, so that I was not far out of the way, because, as I have shown here, they were \$241,384,619. But the whole falling off in customs receipts between the two years was more than \$69,000,000, whereas the falling off in the total imports was only \$3,000,000. It is plain that you could not lose \$69,000,000 in customs receipts from a falling off in total imports of \$3,000,000. So that it stands absolutely established by the official figures that it is the lower rate of duty under the Underwood law and not the smaller imports that is the cause of the smaller income.

I have now received and have before me the monthly summary for December, giving the official figures for the whole calendar year 1914.

I read from this summary, which shows that in December the average ad valorem rate of duty based on total imports was 11.06 per cent. During 1912, the last year in which the Payne rates were in full force, we collected on the average on total imports 18.14 per cent. During 1914, the calendar year that is just passed, we collected, according to this official statement, 13.62 per cent. Now, how can anyone contend that we could collect as much money when we collected 13 per cent as when we collected 18 per cent? The making of such a claim passes comprehension. It must be plain to any fair-minded person who wants to think that they have attributed the falling off in customs revenues to the wrong cause.

The President, in his address to Congress asking for the war tax, as he called it, referred to August, 1913, and said that the falling off in revenue was ten and one-half million dollars. He made a mistake of about a million dollars, but, as it was against his own side of the contention, I presume it was purely accidental, but it shows carelessness. Now, the total imports for August, 1913, were \$137,651,553, and for August, 1914, they were \$129,767,890; mark you, only a decrease of \$7,883,663.

Upon that falling off in the total amount of imports—that is, the decrease of imports of \$7,000,000—the President asked us to believe that we lost \$11,500,000 of revenue. On that theory he must have proposed to put a duty on the goods that we

did not get of about 150 per cent. Of course no Democrat would propose such duties as that. In other words, the amount of imports for August, 1914, were \$7,883,660 short of August, 1913, but assuming there had been no decrease, that the imports for the two months had been the same, we would have collected 13.62 per cent on the \$7,883,660, or \$1,073,754. Give the war credit for the whole decrease in imports that month and you account for \$1,073,754 falling off in customs receipts due to war, and the other \$10,429,835 of the August shortage must be due to the lower rate. In other words, the decrease of imports (war) explains the loss of one million customs revenue in August last, and the low rate of the Underwood law explains the loss of ten millions. The war was a minor factor, and the low rate and large free list was the main factor.

During the seven months immediately preceding the war the total imports were \$1,140,593,373, an increase of \$121,944,698 over the corresponding months of 1913, and yet the receipts from customs fell from \$180,000,698 for the former period to \$156,640,150 for the latter. A decrease of \$23,360,548.

This disposes of the contention that the war was either the sole or the main cause of the reduced customs revenue. I do not think that now, after the campaign excitement is over, that even the President, strong partisan though he may be, would repeat the assertion in his address, to wit:

I need not tell you to what this falling off is due. It is due in chief part, not to the reductions recently made in the customs duties, but to the great decrease in importations; and that is due to the extraordinary extent of the industrial area affected by the present war in Europe.

Mr. FOWLER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. STEENERSON. For a question only.

Mr. FOWLER. Will the gentleman please give us the total income for the fiscal year 1913-14?

Mr. STEENERSON. The total income?

Mr. FOWLER. The total revenue.

Mr. STEENERSON. I am not talking about total income. I am talking about customs revenues, which is what the President referred to in his address. That would be another speech. I have got one, but I am not delivering that speech now.

Mr. FOWLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. No; I will not yield further. These figures are quite complicated, and I desire to finish the argument. I said that it would not be fair to the Democrats to say that the war did not have some effect upon customs receipts, but what are they? How much has the reduced importations reduced the revenues? I have figured out the difference between the imports for each month, August, September, October, November, and December, 1914, according to the official figures, and I find that during those five months since the beginning of the European war the value of the total imports decreased \$134,936,427. But supposing that those imports had come in and that we had collected on them the same rate that we collected on what actually came in? Then you gentlemen who supported the Underwood tariff law ought to be satisfied. If there was no falling off in imports, then the war could not be the reason, for you say the war stops imports. Now, if there had been no falling off, and we had actually collected 13.62 per cent, the duty that we actually collected on what came in, then whatever falling off there was in customs receipts was due to the lower tariff rates. That was the test the President made, the difference between the total imports for August, 1914, as compared with 1913. If we apply the same test to the five months since the war up to the beginning of this year and give the war credit for the whole decrease we find this result. The total decrease for those five months in the value of imports was \$134,936,427. But if those goods had come in, the duty at 13.62 per cent would have amounted to \$17,892,570. That is every cent that you can honestly claim to have been the deficit caused by the European war in the falling off of imports last year as compared with 1913. But what does \$17,000,000 amount to in this deficit? Why, I have here the Treasury statement for February 15. It shows that where you started out with nearly \$150,000,000 balance in the general fund, there was on February 15 a net balance of \$45,433,746.06. And over on this page I find net excess of all disbursements this day over receipts, \$1,231,376; and for the first 15 days of this month of February, 1915, the excess of expenditures over receipts was \$11,586,843. In the corresponding month of 1914 the excess was \$6,686,571. For the fiscal year 1915 to this date the excess of expenditures over receipts, \$100,757,386.75. You have in six and a half months spent more than \$100,000,000 in excess of the receipts of the Government. That is only for the first seven and a half months of this fiscal year. For the fiscal year 1914 you spent \$45,793,482 more than the receipts. At this rate you will exhaust the forty-five million in the general fund inside of four months.

Now, assuming in fairness, as I say, that you lost \$17,000,000 in customs revenue the last five months of 1914 by reason of

the decrease of imports, it would not help you out very much on a deficit of \$100,000,000. But, as I have shown already, take it for the whole calendar year, the decrease of imports is only \$3,000,000, and if it was not for the lower rates and your larger free list you would hardly have lost anything in the customs revenue as compared with the year before.

Now we come to another cause. I do not know how true it is, but the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] the other day, in the debate on the naval bill, said that in addition to the deficit in ordinary expenditures there will be a deficit in the Post Office Department, due to the falling off of postal receipts, of at least \$14,000,000 unless conditions change very much. That condition, he said, had been brought about to a large extent by reason of the war in Europe.

Here is the same scapegoat, that you have been working for! These many months, coming into the postal affairs. You have all read the Scripture of how they used to put the sins of the people on the poor goat and send him out into the wilderness. You have been using the European war as that kind of a goat, and this is the last attempt.

The gentleman from Alabama said:

In addition to that—the deficit in ordinary expenditures—there will be a deficit in the Post Office Department, due to a falling off of postal receipts, of at least \$14,000,000, unless conditions change very much. Of course, that condition has been brought about to a large extent by reason of the war in Europe. Our foreign mail service is not paying the revenues to the Government that it has paid in the past, which is natural, and the cost of the service is practically the same. So that as this condition faces the country and the House, unless you are willing to retrench in expenditures, or unless, when the next Congress meets, you are willing to increase the taxation, you are going to face a deficit in the Treasury of something like \$35,000,000.

Now, here is the majority leader by main strength bringing in an imaginary postal deficit and attributing that to the war. He was not satisfied with the former record in laying the general deficit to the European war, but he says there is a great profit in the foreign mail and the foreign mail is decreasing.

What are the facts? I have here before me the report of the Second Assistant Postmaster General, and this story about a great profit in the foreign mail is an old one, so old that its whiskers reach clear to the floor. [Laughter.] It used to be put forward in Republican administrations as an argument for a subsidy to steamship companies, because they said that we made so much money on the foreign mails that we could afford to spend a few million dollars for subsidies. I am sorry now that we did not do so, for it might have avoided the present demand to tax the people for \$40,000,000 to aid a merchant marine.

Mr. MADDEN. There has been a balance against it for several years, has there not?

Mr. STEENERSON. That depends on how you figure the matter. The Postmaster General in his report says that the net cost of the Foreign Mail Service was \$3,565,323.89; and then, on another page, he says the amount collected as postage prepaid by the sender and as deficit postage collected of the addressees in this country amounted to \$11,872,074.98. But he says the amount of mail to Canada and Mexico is estimated at so much, and of course that did not go by foreign steamship. That leaves \$8,222,000. Of course that would leave a profit of about four and a half million dollars. But remember that under this calculation there is no account taken whatever of the shore expenses.

Under the International Postal Union rule every country collects all the postage upon articles mailed within its boundary and keeps it, and if there is any short postage on incoming mail they collect that and keep it. Each country pays the transportation for the outgoing mail—not only the inland cost, but the ocean cost—and they do not charge anything for the transportation of the incoming mail. The report shows that there were 25,000,000 pounds of foreign mail. Now, if we estimate the incoming mail at 20,000,000 pounds—and that is conservative—we would have 45,000,000 pounds of mail, 20,000,000 pounds transported from the ocean inland and distributed to the addressees, and we would have collected all mail going to foreign countries, hauling that, too, without any charge for it. If you charge at the rate of 8 cents a pound, which Postmaster General Hitchcock estimated it would cost to handle second-class matter, we would have \$3,600,000 to be charged to foreign mail, which, deducted from the alleged profit, leaves just about \$1,000,000 actual profit. If the volume of foreign mail has decreased one-fifth, the loss would only be \$200,000. But it is not correct to say that if there was a falling off it would be all loss, because the expenses would be less if it fell off.

Mr. LLOYD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. LLOYD. Is it not a fact that the postal receipts have fallen off largely since the 1st of August, and that there is a deficit from the 1st of August up to the present time?

Mr. STEENERSON. No, sir; I think the gentleman is entirely mistaken. I telephoned to the Post Office Department yesterday, to the office of the Assistant Postmaster General, Mr. Dockery, and they said that the report for the quarter ending September had not been received, and that there were no official figures whatever to be obtained.

Mr. LLOYD. You may not be able to obtain official figures, but there can be no question of the fact that there has been a positive reduction in receipts since the 1st of August.

Mr. STEENERSON. That may be, but it is not due to falling off in the foreign mail. It is due to the depression of business which is general throughout the country, due to a Democratic administration. [Applause on the Republican side.] There is no better index to the business of the country than the volume of the first-class mail. You can find that in the administrations all the way down from Lincoln to the present time. During the time of protection there has been prosperity and a large volume of mail, and it is the best index. Whenever the shadow of free trade has come upon the country under Democratic administrations the postal receipts have fallen off. [Applause on the Republican side.] I expect they will fall off, but this story of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] that it is due to the falling off of the foreign mail is 99 per cent moonshine. I telephoned to the steamship office, the American Line—

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. In a minute—and they said their load had greatly increased in the trans-Atlantic mail. I have a letter here from the officials to show that the decrease in the foreign mail is but a bagatelle. I will print it. But suppose it was all wiped out, it would not account for a \$14,000,000 deficit or a \$4,000,000 deficit or a \$2,000,000 deficit or a \$1,000,000 deficit in the postal receipts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Illinois to grant me more time.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes more to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. STEENERSON. For a question.

Mr. LLOYD. Is it not true that during the last fiscal year the postal receipts largely increased?

Mr. STEENERSON. I believe they did increase some, but not very much.

Mr. LLOYD. Is it not true that it resulted in a surplus?

Mr. STEENERSON. Oh, that surplus is another fictitious thing. That surplus is not a genuine surplus. The volume of postal business increased because you increased the weight of the mail by lifting the amount to be carried by parcels post up to 50 pounds. Of course, if you are going to do business at a loss, you can increase the receipts, but you increase the expenditures twice as fast as you do the receipts. [Applause on Republican side.] That is not the way we do in the Republican administrations. When we have prosperity and lots of first-class mail, upon which we make a large profit, we show large postal receipts as compared with previous years.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LLOYD. Is it not true—

Mr. STEENERSON. Oh, the gentleman is taking up my time, and I decline to yield. Well, I will take that back. I will yield that he may ask me a question.

Mr. LLOYD. Is it not true that the parcels post results in a profit to the Government?

Mr. STEENERSON. There may be a small profit on some of it, but on the most of it there is a loss. You know very well that is what is the matter with the Post Office Department today. The Postmaster General knows that his orders increasing the weight of mail has so overburdened the transportation companies that if he pays the present rate there will be a deficit. That is what is the matter with him.

Mr. LLOYD. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon—

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman knows very well. He was on the commission that investigated it, and he knows very well that the fear of this administration is that they can not continue to pay the transportation rates under the old weights of four years ago; that very soon there will be new weightings after the volume has been increased by large packages in the parcel post, and that as a result of that the gentleman's commission and the department have proposed to pay by space instead of by weight. That is the secret of that proposition. I voted for it because I wanted to help the Government as much as I could, even though it might be severe on the transportation companies.

Mr. LLOYD. The gentleman certainly wishes to be fair to the Post Office Department?

Mr. STEENERSON. I do.

Mr. LLOYD. And the Post Office Department unquestionably gives out the information that the parcel post has resulted in a profit to the Government.

Mr. STEENERSON. How can they give such information out when they have not got it? [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.] They tell me that they have not got it. I telephoned them yesterday and they said that Gov. Dockery was absent, but they said also that they could not give any such information because the reports had not been received.

Of course, if they give Democrats their confidence and give them information that other members of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads can not obtain, I can not help it. I have to go according to the light that I have, and not according to any such information as the gentleman may have.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, it is unfair to Gov. Dockery, the Third Assistant Postmaster General, to charge him now with failing to give out information.

Mr. STEENERSON. I do not charge that, because they tell me that they do not have it.

Mr. LLOYD. Because he at this date is home on account of the death of one of his friends.

Mr. STEENERSON. Oh, I think the world of Gov. Dockery. He is a friend of mine, and I admire and I love him, but he can not give information that he does not possess.

Mr. LLOYD. He has the information that the parcel post is a success.

Mr. STEENERSON. The Post Office Department proposes to reduce the rural carrier service, and they propose to refuse all new star routes and rural routes, and they propose to economize at the expense of efficiency. They propose to get out of the odium by saying that it is all due to the war, which we can not help; but we will show that it is due to blundering Democratic legislation, which we can help and which we will help in the near future. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman, in connection with the parcel-post proposition, whether or not since the Postmaster General has increased the size of the parcels any steps have been taken to pay the railroad companies of the country for the increased expense of carrying that increased weight?

Mr. STEENERSON. Oh, I believe Congress, on the estimate of the department, made an appropriation of 5 per cent.

Mr. McKENZIE. I mean since the order has been made increasing the size of the parcel.

Mr. STEENERSON. I could not state just now, but I believe that there is great complaint on the part of the railroad companies. How justifiable it is I do not know.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is it not a fact that no steps have been taken to pay the railroad companies, or they have not been paid for the carrying of this matter?

Mr. STEENERSON. I think there is a provision in the pending appropriation bill to pay them by an extra appropriation, and that should be taken out of the fund that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] claims is a surplus, because they have not paid for the services rendered in the last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. I yield the gentleman 10 minutes additional.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. STEENERSON. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. If the Postmaster General made arbitrary ruling in increasing the size of the parcels and compelling the railroad companies to carry those parcels, it would naturally result in an increase of business?

Mr. STEENERSON. Certainly.

Mr. McKENZIE. From which the department is going to profit. Now, if they are not paying the railroads for the service in carrying all this, is it not an unfair proposition to credit the department with an increase while they are compelling the railroads to render service for nothing?

Mr. STEENERSON. That is exactly true. That was the reason why I stated, in answer to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD], that the alleged surplus of last year is largely fictitious, because they had not paid their debts. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. LLOYD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. I will.

Mr. LLOYD. There have been two weightings since the parcel-post law went into effect, and under the law now one-half of the country is receiving its full compensation for every pound of parcel-post matter that is carried.

Mr. STEENERSON. Well, I do not see how that can possibly be correct, because it is not four years since the order increased the weight of the parcel post.

Mr. LLOYD. The gentleman is aware of the fact the country is divided into four sections—

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. LLOYD. One of the four to be weighed each year, so that at the present time the law carries full compensation for two sections.

Mr. STEENERSON. How long ago was it since the last increase of weight?

Mr. LLOYD. Let me finish this. It is also true in the last appropriation bill last year we provided for an increase of 5 per cent on account of the parcel-post matter that—

Mr. STEENERSON. But how long ago was it since the last increase in the size of the package was made?

Mr. LLOYD. That was made nearly a year ago.

Mr. STEENERSON. Nearly a year ago. How, then, can there have been two weighings since that time, when you say they are quadrennial weighings, with one weighing in each section each year, and therefore it will take two years before you could get two sections weighed?

Mr. LLOYD. There has been one weighing since the increase to 20 pounds; there have been two weighings since the increase to 11 pounds.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. Let me finish this. It is a bigger jump from 11 pounds to 50 than from 4 to 11, and consequently the weight of the mail has enormously increased by the latter change, which is not accounted for by the weighing; and I do not believe any living man—not even the experts—can tell anything approximately as to the increased volume of the weight of mail, which necessarily involves an increased pay to the railroads, because they are paid by the pound per mile.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. STEENERSON. I want to finish my sentence, if the gentleman will permit. They receive as much pay for carrying a pound of goods, whether it is flour or cheap merchandise, as letters. I was told the other day by an official of the Government that the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, to save appropriations made for his bureau, had shipped flour in 48-pound sacks to the Indian reservations in different parts of the country by parcel post.

Mr. LLOYD. Will the gentleman yield? The gentleman does not want to be understood as saying they receive the same compensation to-day for carrying a parcel as they do for carrying a letter. The gentleman has evidently made a mistake.

Mr. STEENERSON. I certainly mean to say that the railway-mail pay is based on the per ton per mile or the per pound per mile, and it does not make any difference whether that pound is made up of letters or flour.

Mr. LLOYD. That is the railroad companies.

Mr. STEENERSON. The railroad companies—that is what I am talking about. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. LLOYD. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman has gone astray. [Laughter on the Republican side.] Now, when you increase that kind of matter upon which the revenue, the postage, is very small, you do not increase the income of the Government but very little, but you increase enormously the expenditure of the Government, because you have got to pay the old rate, the same per pound per mile rate you always have paid. Now, you have hitherto been unable to change the railway-mail pay; of course, I am not going to enter into that discussion, but if you are going to make the Post Office Department show anything near a self-sustaining basis, you will have to change it or discontinue that heavy traffic—

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Now, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON (continuing). Because they can not continue to lay the blame on the European war. Yes; I will now yield to the gentleman—for a question.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Well, I am asking a question. Does not the gentleman know that we are paying for the movement of parcels at the rate of 10 cents per ton per mile to the railroads when the express companies are paying at the rate of 5 cents per ton per mile or less on the average? That wherever we pay we have to pay twice as much as the express companies.

Mr. STEENERSON. There is no doubt. I will take the gentleman's word for it, and that shows why we are doing an unprofitable business when we are shipping flour and brick around the country by mail.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Another question.

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman will please excuse me. That shows why there is such anxiety on the part of this administration to change the basis of railway mail pay, because they know they are getting into a hole, and they come up here through the leader of the majority and threaten us with a \$14,000,000 deficit because of the foreign mail, when, as a matter of fact, the foreign mail has fallen off but very slightly.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STEENERSON. For a question.

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland. Is it not a fact that the parcel-post rates are made upon bases which include full payment for railways and all the expenses of the service, besides a margin of over 10 per cent for profit? Is not that a fact?

Mr. STEENERSON. I do not know anything about it. The gentleman is supposed to be the legal adviser in parcel-post matters, and there has been some blundering at work or we would not be in the boat we are. So I am willing to give him credit for it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I have no doubt some theorists have been at work, and in order to get out of the trouble they will again bring up that awful goat with the long beard and lay all their sins upon it. But I want the American people to understand that you can not play that game twice in the same evening. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I insert the letter of the Second Assistant Postmaster General as to the falling off in volume of transatlantic mail. Also an editorial from this morning's Washington Post, and an editorial sent to me commenting on my former speech from the Portland Oregonian, one of the ablest papers in the country.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, February 18, 1915.

HON. HALVOR STEENERSON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: In compliance with your request of yesterday by telephone, I have the honor to inform you that it is estimated that the weight of all mail matter included in the regular mails from the United States for transatlantic destinations dispatched during the months of July to December, 1913, inclusive, was 6,663,624 pounds, and for the same months of 1914, 5,186,480 pounds.

Yours, very truly,

JOSEPH STEWART,
Second Assistant Postmaster General.

Editorial in the Portland Oregonian of January 24, 1915, commenting upon the speech of Representative STEENERSON, of Minnesota, in the House of Representatives on December 31, 1914:

DEFICIT DUE TO BLUNDERS.

In a plain recital of facts Representative STEENERSON disposed of the fiction that the war is responsible for the decrease in revenue and in the Treasury balance. He showed that the cause has been Democratic blunders in overestimating income and in underestimating expenses.

In his final speech on the tariff bill on September 30, 1913, Representative UNDERWOOD estimated customs revenue for the fiscal year 1915 at \$249,000,000, revenue from the income and corporation tax at \$122,000,000, and total revenue at \$1,026,000,000, while he estimated expenditures for that year at \$1,008,000,000, leaving a surplus of \$18,000,000.

President Wilson has attributed the deficit in revenue to a falling off in imports and, consequently, in customs revenue due to the war, but Mr. STEENERSON showed that the actual revenue from that source for 11 months of 1914, with an estimate for December added, fell short of Mr. UNDERWOOD's estimate by only between \$5,000,000 and \$6,000,000. Had Mr. UNDERWOOD's other estimates proved correct, there would still have been a surplus of more than \$12,000,000, and no deficit taxes would have been necessary. But revenue from income and corporation taxes fell short of the Underwood estimate \$51,000,000, while appropriations for the fiscal year 1915 reached a total of \$1,094,168,102 instead of \$1,008,000,000.

Thus total revenue fell short of the estimate by more than \$57,000,000, and total expenditures exceeded the estimate by more than \$86,000,000. This explains the decrease in the Treasury balance from \$144,000,000 to a little more than \$68,000,000. Had the much maligned Payne tariff remained in operation, it would have produced more than enough additional revenue to offset the deficiency from income and corporation tax, for it produced in excess of \$311,000,000 in the fiscal year 1912, or \$68,000,000 more than the Underwood tariff produced in the calendar year 1914.

Indisputable figures prove that the Democrats fall short \$57,000,000 of making the tariff produce enough revenue to meet the expenses of the Government under what they term Republican extravagance. They fall short \$125,000,000 of meeting expenses under Democratic extravagance. They always promise a tariff for revenue only, but their tariffs never produce enough revenue. They always promise economy, but they always practice extravagance.

SOUNDING THE CALL.

Almost coincident with the official announcement that the administration does not recognize any harm done by the tariff to business, and that there will be no tariff relief so long as the present administration remains in power, there comes a call for action from New York and Pennsylvania.

The Pennsylvania House of Representatives has just passed a resolution calling upon Congress to repeal the present Democratic tariff act, and attributing to this legislation the business and industrial hardships which have thrown hundreds of thousands of men and women out of employment. It is proposed that the legislatures of other industrial States shall take similar action.

In New York the Republican Club, which is one of the largest political organizations, has adopted the following resolution:

"We are uncompromisingly in favor of the American system of protection, and we protest against its destruction by the existing tariff law. This law serves the interests of foreign nations; we support the interests of the United States of America. We accept the issue thus made and we confidently appeal to the people for their judgment. The protective system must be restored and maintained. Its abandonment has always been followed by general disaster to all interests. We denounce the existing law as destructive to general business, to labor, and to the farming interests of the country. We heartily indorse the patriotic efforts of Republican United States Senators and Representatives in Congress looking toward a repeal of the existing low tariff law and the enactment of a protective tariff that shall restore to American labor and industry their full rights in the American market."

By standing pat on the existing tariff law the Democrats have made the tariff issue inevitable in the next campaign. While it is true that the stoppage of some of the imports, due to the European war, has been equivalent to a protective tariff, except in the raising of revenue, the greater danger of the present low tariff will be encountered after the present war is over.

If industries have been harmed by the tariff under present conditions, what may be expected when the war ends and millions of workers now on the field of battle return to the mills and factories to work at wages that will be lower than ever before in the history of Europe? They will be willing to work for anything. The United States, under the present tariff, would have no protection against cheap labor competition.

No wonder the call to arms is being sounded by the Republicans. The tariff battle is beginning early, but this is because the tariff has become an issue which even the man in the street understands.

Monthly summary of foreign commerce of the United States, December, 1914.

SUMMARY OF IMPORTS AND EXPORTS.

[Figures in all statements for December, 1914, and for 12 months ending December, 1914, subject to revision.]

Groups.	December—				12 months ending December—					
	1913		1914		1912		1913		1914	
IMPORTS.		Per ct.		Per ct.		Per ct.		Per ct.		Per ct.
Total free of duty.....	\$117,547,218	100.00	\$69,444,579	100.00	\$992,343,921	100.00	\$991,850,747	100.00	\$1,097,937,712	100.00
Total dutiable.....	66,478,353	100.00	45,211,966	100.00	825,729,134	100.00	800,745,733	100.00	691,318,289	100.00
Free and dutiable:										
Crude materials for use in manufacturing.....	62,463,050	33.95	34,189,042	29.82	633,833,071	34.86	604,962,567	33.75	597,920,626	33.42
Foodstuffs in crude condition, and food animals.....	29,916,427	16.25	17,954,204	15.65	237,127,581	13.04	220,784,999	12.32	234,725,244	13.12
Foodstuffs partly or wholly manufactured.....	16,769,368	9.11	16,394,017	14.30	206,134,481	11.34	198,352,663	11.06	256,483,300	14.33
Manufactures for further use in manufacturing.....	28,268,135	15.36	15,746,405	13.74	320,283,741	17.62	340,250,218	18.98	275,585,099	15.40
Manufactures ready for consumption.....	44,616,400	24.25	28,422,282	24.79	404,051,842	22.22	413,430,318	23.06	407,047,570	22.75
Miscellaneous.....	1,992,191	1.08	1,950,595	1.70	16,641,739	.92	14,806,715	.83	17,514,162	.98
Total imports of merchandise.....	184,025,571	100.00	114,656,545	100.00	1,818,073,055	100.00	1,792,596,480	100.00	1,789,276,001	100.00
Per cent of free.....		63.88		60.57		54.58		55.34		61.36
Duties collected from customs.....	21,510,140		14,890,982		326,339,620		310,551,961		241,384,619	
Average ad valorem rate of duty, based on total imports for consumption.....		11.06		13.18		18.14		17.49		13.62
Remaining in warehouse at the end of the month.....	75,370,421		80,666,132							

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. LINTHICUM having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 7515. An act to reserve lands to the Territory of Alaska for educational uses, and for other purposes; and

S. 7188. An act to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office building at Garden City, Kans.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

By unanimous consent, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. STEENERSON, Mr. SWITZER, and Mr. BRYAN were granted leave to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TAVENNER].

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, in some remarks I placed in the RECORD on February 15 I called attention to the fact that four firms, which constitute the War Trust in this country, have drawn down \$175,000,000 worth of contracts from the Government for munitions of war, and that Army and Navy officers have permitted these four concerns to outrageously overcharge the Government for these supplies. I called attention to the fact that Gen. Crozier, the present Chief of Ordnance, who does the buying of these supplies for the Ordnance Department of the Army, was formerly in partnership with the Bethlehem Steel Co.; that he was in partnership with them on the day that he was made Chief of Ordnance; and that ever since he has been Chief of Ordnance he has been awarding that concern contracts running into the millions of dollars annually and has been paying that concern from 20 to 60 per cent more than those millions of dollars worth of supplies could have been manufactured for in the Government arsenals.

My attention has been directed to an answer by Gen. Crozier to the charges which I have made, and in fairness to Gen. Crozier and in order that his views may be in the RECORD, as mine have been placed in the RECORD, and since he states that he is contemplating asking for an investigation, I send the following clipping from the Chicago Tribune to the Clerk and ask that it be read in my time. My only purpose in rising was to put his answer in the RECORD so that it may be compared with the specific statements that I put in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the article.

The Clerk read as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Wednesday, Feb. 17, 1915.]

GRAFT CHARGES STIR UP CROZIER—ORDNANCE CHIEF ASKS INVESTIGATION OF ACCUSATION MADE BY TAVENNER.

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 16.

[Special.]—Gen. William Crozier, Chief of Ordnance, contemplates demanding an investigation, either by the Secretary of War or by Congress, of the charges involving his reputation which were made in the House yesterday by Representative TAVENNER of Illinois.

Mr. TAVENNER charged that a ring of war-munitions manufacturers is raking off \$7,000,000 in exorbitant and illegitimate profits, and that Gen. Crozier, Gen. Humphreys, and other Army and Navy officers are closely connected with these concerns.

Friends of Gen. Crozier in the House are preparing to present his defense, either in a reply to TAVENNER or in a demand for a congressional investigation.

ROORBACK, REPLY TO TAVENNER.

It will be alleged that TAVENNER is disgruntled because of the action of Gen. Crozier in introducing some of the Taylor-system methods into the Rock Island (Ill.) Arsenal, which is situated in the TAVENNER district.

On behalf of Gen. Crozier it is asserted that he never has allowed his former relations with the Bethlehem Iron (now steel) Co. to influence him in passing on questions affecting war-munitions contracts awarded to this or any allied concern. He had a half interest in the patent on the Crozier disappearing gun carriage, which was sold to the Bethlehem company for \$10,000 and royalties on foreign orders. He relinquished his interest after he was appointed Chief of Ordnance and never realized from the patent more than \$5,000, inasmuch as no foreign orders were received.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I have the floor. I do not yield to the gentleman now.

Mr. MOORE. I ask whether the gentleman will yield or whether he insists on this alleged statement of Gen. Crozier being read at this time in full. It is not a statement of Gen. Crozier—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois has the floor, and he declines to yield. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FORCES CUT IN MUNITIONS.

That there was any impropriety in selling the carriage to foreign Governments is denied on the ground that any engineer could duplicate it from the existing photographs. Gen. Crozier also had a patent on a wire gun, which he relinquished to the United States Government voluntarily without compensation.

Gen. Crozier admits that the manufacturers of war munitions have extorted unreasonable prices from the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield time enough to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TAVENNER], in order that the Clerk may read the balance of the article.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. COOPER. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. How much time does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. Time enough for the Clerk to read the balance of the article.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not know how much time that is.

Mr. MOORE. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE. What is the motion before the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not understand the gentleman.

Mr. MOORE. What is the motion before the House?

The CHAIRMAN. There is no motion before the House.

Mr. MOORE. Under what rule are we proceeding?

The CHAIRMAN. We are proceeding under the agreement for general debate.

Mr. MOORE. I ask if there will be an opportunity for anyone to make a statement with regard to this publication?

The CHAIRMAN. Not unless you get time from gentlemen who have control of the time.

Mr. BARTLETT. I insist that the gentleman can not stop debate.

Mr. MOORE. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. COOPER. Regular order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MOORE. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Pennsylvania can not make a parliamentary inquiry while the gentleman from Illinois has the floor without his consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has just announced that the time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARTLETT. I have control of the time, and I have yielded to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MOORE. I beg the gentleman's pardon. The Chair has announced that the time of the gentleman has expired. I make the point that the gentleman from Illinois has no time—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has yielded to the gentleman from Illinois sufficient time in which to finish the reading of the article. The Clerk will continue the reading of the article.

The Clerk read as follows:

He contends, however, that he has introduced Government manufacture of many classes of arms into the arsenals and by that competition forced the private manufacturers to reduce their prices.

Mr. MOORE. Now, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], a member of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. COOPER. Regular order, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MOORE. Would it be in order at the present time to ask unanimous consent?

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman has no right to interrupt the regular order.

Mr. MOORE. I have made a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FOSTER. The gentleman is not in order in doing it.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TAVENNER] is setting up a man of straw. He is attacking a man who is not here.

Mr. TAVENNER. Gen. Crozier is represented here and so is the Steel Trust.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman is representing what is not true. The gentleman is setting up a bugaboo.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I call the gentleman from Pennsylvania to order.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has no right to make that parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MOORE. I ask if I was called to order; if I was violating the rules of the House?

Mr. GORDON. Of course you were. You have no brief from Crozier, have you?

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

Mr. BORLAND. I am entitled to the floor, I believe, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I call the gentleman from Pennsylvania to order.

Mr. MOORE. I am very glad to be called to order, because I am acting in the cause of justice and fair play. But go ahead and gag. That is the way to do it.

Mr. FOSTER. If the gentleman wants to defend the Steel Trust, let him take his time.

Mr. MOORE. You have the power. You put things in the RECORD. Go ahead and encourage the gag. Do it brutally. Go ahead; I defy you.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I call the gentleman to order.

Mr. MOORE. I am willing to be called to order.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman is violating all orderly rules of parliamentary conduct.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] will proceed.

Mr. GORDON. Are you Crozier's attorney? Why are you acting in this way?

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

Mr. GORDON. I think that is outrageous on the part of a man who has been a Member of this House as long as the gentleman. It is an insult to the House.

Mr. MOORE. That is an insult to an individual.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will be seated.

Mr. MOORE. Very well; I respect the Chair and will take my seat.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, when I rose I was about to remark that I would yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] to make a request for unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD—

Mr. MOORE. I do not care to do that. The time to do that is right now.

Mr. BORLAND. But I soon saw that the gentleman did not want to do that, but wanted to inject into the RECORD something that the rules of the House would not permit him to put into the RECORD, and at that point I withdrew or abandoned my intention to yield to the gentleman. When the proper time comes, he can defend the Steel Trust or anybody else.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BORLAND. No. The gentleman can reply in his own time.

Mr. MOORE. I do not care to.

Mr. BORLAND. Now I want to discuss two phases of this pension appropriation bill, which is supposed to be under debate in this House. It is always a matter of surprise to the American people to learn the amount that is paid out by this Government for pensions 50 years after the close of the Civil War. But there are more surprises than that in the pension law. I find that there is scarcely an American citizen anywhere who understands that the Government is to-day paying more than a million dollars to nonresident foreigners under the operation of the present pension laws.

Away back in 1893 an attempt was made to correct this evil, and a report at that time shows that about 3,000 foreigners were drawing pensions under the Federal pension laws, and that the amount paid them was between \$350,000 and \$400,000. To-day more than 5,000 persons who are nonresident foreigners are drawing pensions, and the amount paid them is over a million dollars.

Now, the only justification that ever was given for this payment of foreign pensions was that a few men might have come to this country from foreign countries and lost their lives here and left dependent widows or children or mothers in the old country. But if any men lost their lives 50 years ago under the American flag and left dependent widows or mothers in the old country, the number of such dependents would decrease rapidly in the generation following the Civil War. The explanation of the fact that the amount has increased rapidly and steadily is that men who are drawing pensions have expatriated themselves and have become citizens or subjects of other countries.

Now, in fact, that is the case. We are sending abroad to-day a million dollars of American money, and we are doing what no other nation ever did, and, I undertake to say, what no other nation ever will do, namely, continuing the payment of pensions to men who are no longer citizens of the country they served. Twenty-six hundred of these men live in Canada; about 500 of them live in Germany; some 900 of them live in the British Isles. This country could not become involved in a war with any country on earth without seeing its own money and sometimes the men who draw its own money opposing it in that contest. No nation ever did that.

I purpose and reserve the right to offer to this pension appropriation bill when it reaches the amendment stage an amendment forbidding the payment of pensions to nonresident foreigners, except for disabilities contracted in the service. Gentlemen will recognize that we have a dual system of pensions in this country, which differs from the pension systems of

other countries. All countries pay pensions. All countries pay pensions on the basis of disabilities contracted in the service, and that is the true basis for pensions. Any man who entered the service of his country and suffered a permanent disability thereby has a claim upon the gratitude of his fellow citizens as long as he or those dependent upon him live. But we entered upon a much wider field than that. We entered upon what no nation has ever done—an old-age pension, limited to those who appeared upon certain muster rolls, and under that old-age pension system the number of foreigners drawing pensions has almost doubled.

Now, if we are going to pay old-age pensions, I do not see any legitimate reason why we should not pay them to the man who served his country by pushing the plow and to the man who served his country by laying brick and to the man who in an engine cab served his country by driving an engine and who has done it efficiently and honestly for 40 or 50 years. I do not see why an old-age pension is not coming to the man who builds up his country in time of peace, if it is purely a question of old-age pensions. But we have limited these old-age pensions to a certain class of our citizens, and, under that system, the most liberal proposition that any nation ever advanced, we still continue to extend an old-age pension to men who are not citizens of the United States.

It was objected when this matter was up in the Sixty-second Congress that the old soldier must have some advocates on this floor; in other words, politics—partisan politics—demanded that no possible reduction or correction be made, even of the most flagrant evils in the pension laws, for fear that the sensibilities of the old soldiers might be hurt.

Now, let us consider what the old soldiers themselves think about this thing. You will not find an old soldier in your district who will justify the payment of pensions to men who have renounced and abandoned the flag under which they fought. The man who is to-day the Commissioner of Pensions of this Government is an old soldier, and a good one, and he recommends that the payment of pensions to nonresident foreigners cease. Here is what he says about it:

Mr. DAVIS. I would like to ask a formal question, and I do not ask the commissioner to answer it if he does not desire to do so: In your judgment, Mr. Commissioner, is it proper for a man who rendered service in the Civil War or any other military service for the United States Government, and who because of that service was placed upon the pension roll, to be deprived of that pension because of the fact that subsequently he declared his allegiance to some other country than the United States? In your opinion, Mr. Commissioner, should or should not that fact bar him from receiving the pension that he obtained as a service pension because of his service to the United States? You need not answer that question if you prefer not to do so.

Mr. SALTZGABER. I have an opinion on the subject, and it is this: I am so thoroughly American that I believe that a man who abjures his allegiance to this country ought not to receive any reward from it.

Mr. DONOHUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. DONOHUE. The gentleman of course knows that it does not follow that because a man has decided to reside abroad he has renounced his allegiance to the United States.

Mr. BARTLETT. This does not affect him, then?

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman will see very readily that this would not affect Americans temporarily abroad for business, or official positions, or anything else. It is confined to men who are not Americans and possibly never were.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. GOULDEN. Has the gentleman any information as to how many of these 5,000 men have renounced their allegiance to this Government? To that extent I agree with him. No pensioner who has expatriated himself and is not crippled or in bad health from service origin should be carried on the rolls.

Mr. BORLAND. The greater part of the 5,000 have renounced their allegiance. The commissioner said in answer to a question in a former hearing that those who were abroad for business or pleasure or as foreign representatives of American houses, or as American consular representatives were a very trifling number.

Mr. BARTLETT. About 30.

Mr. GOULDEN. How many are living in Canada? Of course the gentleman knows that a large number of our citizens have gone to Canada, and I want to know if they have renounced their citizenship.

Mr. BORLAND. The greater part of them have become Canadian citizens.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I suggest that most of those who came to this country from Canada at the time of the war and fought in the Federal Army have gone back to Canada and taken up lands there.

Mr. BORLAND. Under the homestead laws of Canada they had to renounce their allegiance to this Government.

Mr. SHERWOOD. I propose to support the gentleman's amendment. I think it is on the right line. Heretofore that amendment has not included men who were disabled in the service. The gentleman's amendment does. So there can be no possible injustice to any pensioner—any soldier who served during the war. Now, I understand that a great majority of the Canadian soldiers who were with us in 1861–1865 have sworn allegiance to the British Government. Those men are drawing pensions. In case of a war with Great Britain we would have men fighting against us who were pensioners under the United States.

Mr. BORLAND. I am very glad to have this statement from Gen. SHERWOOD, the man who occupies the honored position in this House of being the only general officer on the Union side in that great struggle who is now a Member of Congress and who represents as thoroughly as any man can the feelings and sentiments and patriotic views of the American soldier. He says that this amendment so limited is an absolute justice to the American pensioner.

Mr. DONOHUE. How would the gentleman feel toward a man who rendered military service here, became a citizen, resided here for 8 or 10 years after the close of the war, went back to Germany, and has never renounced his American citizenship?

Mr. BORLAND. He would not be affected by this.

Now, there is another matter I want to speak of in the brief time I intend to hold the attention of the House, which has always seemed to me to be a gross evil in the pension laws, but which has never seemed to other gentlemen to be as clear an injustice as it has seemed to me. I purpose to offer another amendment providing that no part of the pension appropriation shall be paid to any person who is drawing salary or emoluments of any kind from the Federal Government in excess of \$1,000. [Applause.] I place the amount at \$1,000 because I believe a man who is drawing \$1,000 or over from the Federal Government is doing it on the theory that he is performing a man's full work and that his disabilities, if any, contracted in the service have not decreased his earning power. If a man who was in that great struggle is to-day alive and able to hold a full-salaried position, he is fortunate beyond the average run of mankind.

But the worst evil is simply this: The men who are the beneficiaries of this system do not want any investigation made as to how many men are drawing emoluments from this Government. I know a case—I will not call the name because I do not care to be invidious in a public speech—where a man is drawing a pension as an officer of the Federal Army and is drawing \$6,000 a year from the Federal Government as a retired United States judge and \$7,500 as a Member of the great legislative body of the Nation. He is drawing three separate salaries or emoluments from the Federal Government. I know of another case where a man is drawing \$6,000 a year as a retired Federal judge, \$50 a month as a pension, and is engaged in the practice of law, representing large railroad and corporate interests. Those are the men who will resist with all the force of which they are capable, even the proposition to investigate into this thing. I believe that there are approximately 3,000 to 5,000 men, at least 3,000, upon the pay rolls of the Federal Government under one guise or another, many of them as retired Federal judges and other officials of that kind, who are drawing pensions. These men have enjoyed, to a large extent, the rewards and profits of their military service and their military renown, and they are drawing pensions which are needed in many cases by many men who have been less fortunate.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does the gentleman make any distinction between a soldier who is drawing a pension for a disability incurred in the service and one who is drawing a pension merely on account of age and service?

Mr. BORLAND. The distinction could be made easily. The surprising thing about the American people is this: We are spending to-day nearly twice as much for the pension roll as we are for the maintenance of a standing army in a nation of 100,000,000 people. That is 50 years after the close of the war. The people are going to demand that we spend a little more for national protection and a little less for partisan politics. Gentlemen will not dodge that issue when the people begin to wonder where their money has gone that has been spent under the guise of military armament when they find that we have not the national protection for the money expended.

To-day, 50 years after the war, nearly twice as much is spent for pensions as is spent for military purposes. If the pensions we are paying would guarantee the safety of the Nation, we would be the best-protected Nation under the sun; but nobody believe that it does. It has dwindled down into an old-age pension, possibly deserved in most cases; but I would like

to have it expended in all cases for those who deserve it, and to cut out men who are getting \$6,000 as retired Federal judges, and cut off the men that have renounced and abandoned the country that pays them the pension. [Applause.]

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO].

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, we are now considering the annual appropriation bill, making appropriations to pay the pension roll to the extent of \$165,000,000. That does not cover all of the actual pensions that the Federal Government pays; it does not cover \$43,500 that is spent down in the Arkansas national forests in the way of pensions under the pretense of salaries for men engaged in conservation.

In that connection I want to call attention to a letter published in the Danville Democrat, Danville, Ark., an excellent newspaper, which was received by me this morning. The editor of the paper refers to the writer of the letter as follows:

The writer of the above article is a college man, a young man, and with his wife and babies lives on a homestead in Yell County, and knows the conditions of which he writes.

In other words, this is a letter from a college-bred man, of a man who has gone into that country, entered a homestead on the identical lands which certain gentlemen claim are not fit for agricultural purposes, has made him a good home, and who knows something about the conditions that exist there, and certainly has the knowledge and ability to discuss the things considered in that letter. I shall not take time to read the letter at length, but I will ask unanimous consent to print the newspaper clipping in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing the matter indicated in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to above is as follows:

FOREST RESERVE SHOULD BE ABOLISHED—A HOMESTEADER 30 MILES FROM THE RAILROAD IN YELL COUNTY SAYS ALL OF THE GOVERNMENT LAND COULD BE MADE A GOOD HOME FOR SETTLERS—READ HIS LETTER.

BLUFFTON, ARK., January 29, 1915.

Mr. T. L. POUND,
Danville, Ark.

MY DEAR SIR: Facts and figures proven by carefully kept books on my homestead for the past three years show that even the roughest land is worth taking, and a very little capital is necessary to keep a farmer going here till his land properly handled will.

Let us compare the tenant farmer and homesteader. The tenant gives one-third to one-fourth of his profitable time to his landlord. He is busy producing, harvesting, and marketing his crop but about three-fourths of his time, and he is fortunate, indeed, if he makes expenses during the rest of the time. Therefore the tenant farmer gives away or loses at least 5½ months or 143 working days each year and wonders why he does not get anything ahead. But if a man in any other business lost 143 days annually from office or shop, how soon would he be bankrupt? Is it any wonder "landlordism and the tenant farmer" ruined Ireland, caused the Mexican revolution, and is the greatest problem before the United States to-day?

Now for the homesteader on a hilly, rocky tract of land "away back in the sticks." His cash investment is practically nothing, and in this is the only likeness to the tenant farmer, for the average 40 acres here has 200,000 feet in pine alone, enough for house, barn, and fence. The same 40 acres produces enough grass for a team of horses and several cows, enough mast-bearing trees to produce 1,000 pounds of pork three years out of five, enough berries and wild fruit for an ordinary family, and has enough table-land with a clay subsoil so that two or more 5 to 10 acre fields can be tilled. Now, let the homesteader give 143 days each year to clearing land, building, hauling rock, filling low places with brush and rock, hauling leaves and wash to the hill-tops where the soil is light, and in a few years he has a valuable farm, and has produced a good living also if he has planted the crops to supply his table and feed his stock and the big cotton raiser in the bottom lands.

This is no idle dream, but a fact proven by my books and the experience of other farmers here.

But our homestead land is practically all taken. Yes! but our national forest is made up of exactly the same kind of land my neighbors and I have been fortunate enough to get. Room for thousands of farms; for good, industrious, homeless families who, wasting 143 days each annually instead of using this time to improve their part of our great State and Nation, is being held in idleness, and why? Not because a Government of the people, for the people, and by the people wish to conserve our resources instead of developing them, but because the organization controlling our national forest is such that political jobs are in the balance and the question is not conserve or develop, but of keep or lose the job, and the forester is human like you and I, and like you and I, has a family to support; and, like you and I, if he does not look out for his business nobody will. As an example, take the following incident to which I can and will if necessary make oath. My friend Mr. X, wishing to homestead a very good agricultural tract in the national forest, made application for same. His case was referred to the local forest ranger, Mr. Y, also my personal friend. Mr. Y spent perhaps two hours in his investigation in which he never saw the land Mr. X wanted, and reported that he had failed to find level land enough for a building site. Consequently, Mr. X and his large family lost no less than 400 valuable days last year, will lose as much or more this year, and the land which should now be a good farm producing a good living for X and his family is being carefully conserved as a national reserve by the forest organization, because Mr. Y knew if Mr. X made a success in a part of the forest Mr. Z would in another part, and so on, till soon Mr. Y would have no forest to supply him a job, and do you blame Mr. Y? I do not, but Mr. Y should not be the man to decide whether Mr. X could make a living on a certain piece of land or not, only Mr. X can do that, and he should have the chance.

Our national forest with all its land and timber is now producing nothing.

Only a few men are benefited by it, and they are paid from other sources, while similar country in France and Germany is producing more than our richest communities. The home is the real basis of a country's wealth, and not the hoarded millions of a few.

Each tenant farmer is losing 143 days annually, which if properly used would in a few years put the territory now held as national forest in Arkansas in a class with the hill country of Virginia, Pennsylvania, or New York State, so far as productiveness goes, and the tenant be glad to use the time he is now wasting to develop the resources of our forest if he was permitted to homestead it. If he is not permitted to homestead this land, what will be done with it? If the Government sells it to individuals or corporations, no matter what amount of cash the Government might get it would lose in the end. Our tenant problem would be increased instead of diminished, because the lumberman would become a landlord and more tenant farmers and farming would be the result.

Then why delay? As a State and Nation we are not producing too much—not producing enough. When we consider that almost half the producers of our land are losing 143 days annually, the move to lessen this terrible waste of time, to lessen the tenant problem, to produce more homes, to raise men's efficiency as producers and citizens, is the move that will produce more and lasting profits for a Government of, for, and by the people than any other, no matter what the cash in the transaction might be. And opening the forest to the homesteader is this one great move.

H. C. SHORT.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KIRKPATRICK].

Mr. KIRKPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, as one of the survivors of the Civil War between the States I simply ask leave to extend my remarks on the subject of the payment of pensions.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE].

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to renew my earnest protest against the proposed national child-labor legislation. The bill proposes to prevent the employment of children under 14 and 16 years of age in mines, quarries, mills, canneries, manufactories, workshops, factories, and mills of all kinds of enterprises. It further proposes to limit the hours of labor per day. Heretofore no one has seriously contended that this question should be taken by the Federal Government from State jurisdiction. I rise for the purpose of requesting the membership of this House to send for the so-called child-labor bill and some time at their leisure read it and study it carefully. This bill was taken up and considered under suspension of rules, which prevented the usual discussion. Only 40 minutes were given to the consideration under a rule, and therefore the membership of the House had no opportunity to give this bill proper consideration. I never heard of this bill until it was up for action. Those opposing the bill had no opportunity to present views in opposition to it on account of the limit of time, and we resorted to the only method we had, and that was to filibuster against the passage of the bill. I have no apologies to make for the part I took in trying to prevent the passage of the bill by filibuster tactics. I consider the bill the most flagrant violation of constitutional rights of any bill that has passed this House since I have been here. It absolutely absorbs all State rights guaranteed by the Constitution and turns over to Federal authorities complete jurisdiction to direct the internal affairs of the States.

Those of you who have been to sawmills and to rock quarries and have heard the familiar call, "water boy," if this bill becomes a law, will hear that call no more. It will be for "water man." Under the provisions of the bill a boy under 16 years of age can not give water to a mule or ox used at a rock quarry or mine. No boy or girl can be employed in any capacity, in any kind of work where peaches, tomatoes, beans, or any agricultural product is being prepared for interstate shipment, because if children are so employed the man who ships the goods produced where the boy who gave water to mule or worked in the cannery will be indicted by the Federal Government. In my State agriculture is being promoted very rapidly through the Agricultural Department, and one of the greatest means of promotion is the canning club.

The school-teachers are organizing associations in every county, and you can read in the agricultural bulletins where little girls 12 and 13 years of age have had tomato patches and have canned their tomatoes in association with others and have shipped them to the State of New York and other places and have received enormous profits, and this method has encouraged others to raise tomatoes. I do not think there is any question but that this bill will prevent little girls or boys under the age of 14 years from associating themselves together with a teacher or any other person for the purpose of raising tomatoes and canning them and shipping them out of the State, because one of the provisions of the bill is about canneries. The defini-

tion in the bill says that a dealer is an individual. A little girl is an individual within the meaning of the bill if she is raising tomatoes. It also uses the phrase "unincorporated association," and these people who are associated together for the purpose of raising and canning tomatoes, peaches, beans, or anything else are an "unincorporated association" of people brought together for the purpose of promoting this industry.

The bill reads as follows:

It shall be unlawful for any producer, manufacturer, or dealer to ship or deliver for shipment in interstate commerce the products of any mine or quarry which have been produced, in whole or in part, by the labor of children under the age of 16 years, or the products of any mill, cannery, workshop, factory, or manufacturing establishment which have been produced, in whole or in part, by the labor of children under the age of 14 years, or by the labor of children between the age of 14 years and 16 years, who work more than eight hours in one day.

The word "dealer" as used in this act shall be construed to include any individual or corporation or the members of any partnership or other unincorporated association.

This bill not only proposes to regulate cotton mills, knitting mills, and all kinds of factories by Federal statute, but it reaches out and takes in farming and mining institutions. The conditions in the New England States are entirely different from conditions in the South. The work done by children of reasonable age in mills, saw mills, cotton gins, canneries, and the various other enterprises of the South should not be prohibited by Federal laws inspired by philanthropists knowing nothing about healthful and honorable employment in the South. It is a very embarrassing situation in which the Democratic Party finds itself advocating this kind of legislation. It has always contended for State rights, and now pretends to believe in State rights. Now the Republican Party can say, "Oh you Democratic Party, what have you done with your States rights Jeffersonian doctrine?"

If this bill becomes a law, the next move will be to prevent the interstate shipping of cotton when children under 16 years of age participate in making or picking the cotton. Those good philanthropists will be here in a few years demanding that the farmer be prevented from employing on his farm boys under 16, and they will tell this Congress about the illiteracy of children that should be in school. Then this so-called humanitarian legislation will be enacted by the Federal Government compelling education of all races and restricting child labor on the farm to 16 years of age. The negro matures rapidly and makes a good farm laborer at 12 years of age. At 15 they are strong men. The whites mature early in the South, and many boys perform a man's labor on the farm before they are 16 years of age, working on the farm and attending school during the school periods.

Mr. Speaker, this bill also launches the eight-hour day law, to be applied by the Federal Government to agricultural enterprises. I knew that agriculture would some day be confronted with the Federal Government fixing the hours of labor and making it a criminal offense to labor over eight hours each day even on the farm, but I did not expect the question to come up so soon. There are seasons when the farmer must work or gather his crops or he will almost lose it. I hope I will never see Congress enact laws prohibiting the shipping of cotton from my State unless the farmer complies with eight or seven hour day regulation of labor, and yet that principle is in this bill. Should a cannery, quarry, mill, factory, saw mill, cotton gin, or any kind of mill enterprise violate the child-labor restrictions or work them over eight hours any day the products of such an enterprise can not be sold out of the State. A severe Federal penalty is provided for both the seller and the purchaser.

Some gentlemen were disposed to criticize me for filibustering against this bill. Permit me to assure you that as long as the people of Georgia keep me here to represent my State and district I shall speak, filibuster, and use all legitimate means to prevent legislation giving the National Government the power of exercising the prerogative of the States in the restriction of labor.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, do you propose to exclude the orphan on the humanitarian appeal from honest work and doing honest labor in the industrial pursuits of the farming districts, that they may live honestly and independently?

I thoroughly agree with gentlemen that there should be restriction of child labor in factories. The restriction should be reasonable and humane. What is reasonable and humane is a question for the respective States to solve. There are no doubt abuses; but, Mr. Speaker, we should not trample upon the Constitution to reach abuses the States should correct. Besides, there are some provisions in this bill I can not espouse, even by State enactment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. BARTLETT. I yield further time to the gentleman.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I think that the States only have a right to legislate on this question. It is a question for each State to settle; it is not a Federal question. The States can better solve these industrial questions. I am willing to abide the action of the State of Georgia on these and all other questions delegated to the State by the Constitution, and I think other Members should be willing to abide the action of their States. Several times I have defended the laws of my State on this floor, and no man can assail the laws of my State on this floor unchallenged; and like Ruth said to Naomi, I stand here to-day and say in regard to Georgia, "Whither thou goest I will go; where thou lodgest I will lodge; thy people shall be my people and thy God my God." [Applause.]

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Georgia to yield me five minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT. I have not the time, I am sorry to say to the gentleman.

Mr. PALMER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TRIBBLE] has just been yielded time in which to make an attack on a bill which was passed in this House two or three days ago.

Mr. TRIBBLE. But the gentleman did not give me any chance to oppose it when it was passed.

Mr. PALMER. The gentleman did not use all of the time he had.

Mr. BARTLETT. I have not the time.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I did not expect, of course, to discuss the child-labor question to-day. I did not expect that anybody who was opposed to the bill and who failed to use all of the time which was allotted to those in opposition to the bill when it came up a couple of days ago would find it necessary—

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. Not now—would find it necessary after the bill had passed by a vote of about 6 to 1 discuss the bill and complain of the action of the House. It is true that it was not discussed at any great length in the House, but I doubt if any bill which has been before the House during this session has received more attention from the country, and I doubt if Members have received more communications and information about any bill which has been before the House this session than they have about this child-labor bill. When it came into the House the Members all knew what the bill was. They knew that extensive hearings had been held before the Committee on Labor, that there had been a unanimous report of that committee in favor of the bill, and that the standard fixed by the bill was the same in many respects as had already been adopted in nearly 40 of the States in the Union with which Members here were all very familiar. It is a significant and interesting fact that the only objection to the bill, voiced upon the floor in speech and by vote upon the roll call, came from three or four States in the South which are notoriously lax in child-labor laws, States which have been exploiting the little children for years in order to swell the profits of the manufacturers and employers of labor there. In the other States of the Union, where attention has been given to the matter, Members were familiar with the standard employed, and, in sympathy with the feeling of the people in those States, were unanimously for the bill. I did not consider it necessary that there should be any fuller discussion about a measure on which the feeling of the House is so overwhelmingly in its favor as this child-labor legislation.

Now, the gentleman says it is not fair to a State like Georgia to enforce this kind of a law, and the arguments which he presents are, in fact, a just ground for Federal legislation. It is absolutely necessary in the interest of fairness, because the friends of child-labor legislation have discovered that in every State where they plead for laws which will protect the little children they are met with this answer from the employer of labor, that it is not fair to put us in competition with a producer of other States where a less rigid standard is enforced. There is force in that argument, and it shows that interstate commerce is at the very root of this question of child labor. I grant that 30, 40, or 50 years ago, when transportation facilities were not so adequate, when business between the States was not so common, it might have offended my own sense of the rights of the several States to have urged this kind of legislation. But times have changed and we must change with them. The days of railways, of rapid express freight trains from one end of the country to the other, have come and commerce between the States is as common as commerce within the States, and in fairness to those who produce in one State and send their products into the commerce of the other States, the same standard of labor ought to be employed everywhere.

Now, the gentleman's objection that this would prevent a boy or a girl from canning tomatoes in company with a half dozen other children is all bosh, as the gentleman must know—

Mr. TRIBBLE. Read your bill.

Mr. PALMER. I have read the bill; I know all about the bill.

Mr. TRIBBLE. So do I, since I have studied it.

Mr. PALMER. It provides against labor of that kind in workshops, canneries, manufacturing establishments, and factories, and the gentleman will not say that the circumstances to which he refers could make a factory or a workshop or a cannery. It will not interfere with work upon the farm, it will not interfere with work in the household, it will not interfere except in places where labor is employed somewhat en masse—in factories, canneries, and workshops, and places of that character—and there I submit that the law ought to lay its hand in order to prevent employers of labor in every State from grinding down the little children against the interest of future generations of American men and women. [Applause.]

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask the privilege of extending my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, about a half an hour ago the eloquent gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], speaking to this bill, made the statement that there was no possibility of our Government going into war. I hope that that statement is true. There is no one in the United States who desires such a fatality as war. I want to speak just briefly of what seems to me a very dangerous parallel with the days preceding the War of 1812. I seize upon this time to do it because to-day is the day that the German order, announced February 4, blockading the island of Great Britain takes effect. I should like to recall to the House some of the diplomatic orders prior to the second war of independence. It was early in 1806 that Great Britain blockaded portions of the French border and declared the mouths of four rivers in a state of blockade against all neutral territory. Those rivers were the Ems, the Elbe, the Weiser, and the Trave. That decree of Great Britain was followed by Napoleon on the 11th of November of the same year by the famous Berlin decree which blockaded the island of Great Britain against all neutral vessels. That was in November, as I have said. Then, in January, 1807—to be specific, January 6—there was a retaliation on the part of Great Britain in her famous orders in council, and this was to blockade all of France by forbidding neutral vessels from trading between ports of France or her allies. Then, in November following Great Britain issued a second order in council more sweeping, which included the obligation to blockade all the possessions of France and all her allies. It forbade trade with the ports of France or her allies, or even with any port of Europe from which the British flag was excluded without a clearance obtained from a British port. This was followed by the most sweeping order of blockade in our history. It was the second order of Napoleon in the famous blockade of Milan. The decree in November, 1807, went thus far: It declared that all vessels submitting to English search or consenting to a voyage to England or to the payment of any English tax, as well as every vessel that should sail to or from a port of Great Britain or her possessions, or in any country occupied by British troops, would be deemed a lawful prize.

These four decrees, or rather five, if the first partial order is included, on the part of Great Britain and France literally swept the commerce of neutral countries from the sea. Our own country suffered most. While the measures were aimed at others, they hit us hardest. It was at this time that President Jefferson finally resorted to the famous embargo act which was nicknamed "O-grab-me act." He believed that if the embargo act could have been made effective by receiving support from this country it would have prevented the war of 1812; but it was so unpopular, especially in certain sections of the country in which commerce was almost totally destroyed, that a revulsion of public opinion was worked against the administration, and in 1808, when Madison was a candidate for election to succeed Jefferson, an issue was made before the country against the embargo act. However, Madison won upon a promise that relief would be granted. This was attempted when he modified the act by the famous non-intercourse act of 1809, two years after the embargo act. The nonintercourse act had the effect to limit the shipping of goods from this country to the belligerent countries, or to those at war, instead of to all the countries then involved in the former decree, the embargo. Finally war came. It came in obedience to

a declaration on the 18th of June, 1812. Jefferson feared it and did what he could to prevent it. He but deferred it. Madison had opposed war to the point where the people said, "Madison can not be kicked into a war." This statement was employed as a slogan by those unfriendly to the administration. Finally public opinion became so strong that he literally was forced into the struggle. It did not require any overt act to induce it—no sinking of a vessel—but only an employment of such maritime rights as England claimed as hers. This produced war in 1812. McKinley in 1898 tried to prevent war and was successful up to a certain point, but at the cost of the most abusive language, and he ultimately went into war as a response to the demands of the people of the country which he could no longer restrain. In obedience to what was done then and in the light of 1812 and 1898, I wish that the membership of the House, especially that portion of it which believes sincerely that there will not be war, hoping at least that the President can prevent war—for nobody would think for a moment that the President would do anything knowingly that would precipitate it; everybody agrees to that—I wish that the membership of the House would notice the events that have taken place since the 1st of August last, with special reference to the possibilities confronting us as a Nation at this hour.

On November 4 Great Britain pronounced the North Sea in a blockade, to take effect on November 5, the day after. On February 4 Germany pronounced the blockade about the British Isles, including not only the water surrounding the isles but also reaching out to all vessels that would sail the sea destined to England. While it does not so specify, it really means that. That order was to take effect not the day after, but on the 18th, which is to-day. I do not believe that anyone would question England's right to make such an order, however hurtful it must be to neutral commerce. I do not believe that many will seriously question Germany's right, so far as international law will go, to do what she proposes to take effect to-day, however hazardous it may be for neutrals.

On the 28th of last December our President sent a note to England through the State Department which, to say the least, was simply to the effect of "Come, let us reason about this matter." It was not in a spirit of jingoism, but it, in a friendly spirit, called attention of England to the disturbance that her exercise of power on the sea over neutrals was placing our commerce. Over this England seemed, in a sense, to be surprised. But while everyone will admit that Great Britain has the right to stop our vessels for the time and to search for contraband of war, we have rights which must be respected, which can not be violated on mere suspicion. Notice the question of conditional contraband and the hauling into port of our vessels upon mere suspicion. This has seriously harmed our rights upon the seas. Conditional contraband can be so expanded by mere suspicion to cover all foodstuffs. When food goes to Germany in a vessel like the *Wülhelmina*, it will be held up in order to see whether it has conditional contraband. Although it is not to be used by combatants, it is held as though it were so destined. Germany declares that all food that goes to Germany must be held in her possession. In other words, the German Government will take possession, but has assured our Government it will be turned over to noncombatants. Great Britain feels her right to forbid the food to go to Germany because of that order, for the conditional contraband in this case, according to her interpretation, would become absolute contraband. Note the situation as it increases in complication. These decrees, passing as they are, and with Great Britain running up our flag over an English sailing vessel, are indicative to me and to you that events are traveling fearfully, rapidly toward what I fear may be a brink where the unexpected may take place.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] has expired.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes more to the gentleman.

I simply want to call the attention of the House to this dangerous parallel. Compare the decrees of France and England prior to 1812 with the following decrees:

WAR ZONES COMPARED.

A comparison of the British and German war-zone orders disclosed these striking facts:

First. The British Government on November 4 notified the United States Government that its war zone would be effective from November 5—one day's notice.

Second. The German Government issued its war-zone proclamation on February 4 and communicated it to Ambassador Gerard on the same day, announcing that the German war zone around the British Isles would be effective after February 18—15 days' notice.

Third. The British war zone covers the whole of the North Sea.

Fourth. The German war zone covers the entire English Channel and all the territorial and high sea waters around the British Isles.

Fifth. The British war-zone order sought to close the north of Scotland route around the British Isles to Norway, the Baltic, Denmark, and Holland.

Sixth. The German war zone seeks to close the southern or English Channel route around the British Isles to Holland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and the Baltic.

Seventh. The British war-zone decree drew an arbitrary line from the Hebrides Islands, along the Scottish coast, to Iceland, and warned neutral shipping that it would cross this line at its risk, but that ships of neutral nations might go to Holland and other neutral nations along the eastern littoral of the North Sea by taking the English Channel and Strait of Dover route.

Eighth. The German war zone declares that neutral vessels will be exposed to danger in the English Channel, but routes of navigation around the north of Scotland Islands in the eastern part of the North Sea and in a strip 30 miles wide along the Dutch coast are not open to the danger zone.

Ninth. The Germans make the southern channel route dangerous and declare the north of Scotland route safe, while the British declare the north of Scotland route dangerous and the English Channel route safe, the effect of this being that neither the northern nor the southern routes around England will be safe for neutral vessels.

Tenth. The British war-zone order was based on the discovery of mines in the North Sea, while the German decree is based on England's attitude toward contraband, the *Wilhelmina* case, and England's establishment of a war zone.

While we all hope that there will be power enough to maintain a peaceful basis against what may take place in a few days to prevent this Nation going into trouble, yet no Member of this House can close his eyes to what took place prior to 1812, and to what might take place here in our own country. Suppose one of our vessels flying the American flag goes into the neutral waters which they are forbidden to enter by this decree, and suppose that vessel should be sunk, what will be our attitude? Suppose some of our citizens are on such a vessel, what will be our attitude?

Mr. BUTLER. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Why not let the vessel for the time being stay out of this war zone?

Mr. FESS. That would be my advice. However, the Nation has not agreed to lay an embargo; it is loudly demanded by some citizens. And I want to clinch what I am saying by this statement. I opposed the ship-purchase bill generally on the ground of the danger that we are courting. The following is a statement from the London Times, to which I wish to call your attention. I simply want to warn our people.

The possibilities of international trouble which it contains are at least as clear. Questions of contraband, and of search for contraband, are difficult and delicate enough between belligerents and neutrals, when the neutral ships are in private ownership. It is manifest that they would be very gravely complicated were the neutral ships themselves the property of a neutral State. The acquisition of a number of interned belligerent vessels for the purpose of employing them in the service of a neutral State would certainly afford ground for controversies which it must be the wish and the interest of real neutrals to avoid.

When you say the President can prevent war, you are putting a good deal of obligation upon him if something might happen in this country. [Applause.]

It will not do to pride ourselves upon professions of peace and talk and vote for war-making measures. It is the crassest ignorance to depend on the head of the Nation for peace. The Executive is not the war-making body of this Nation. Let some overt act of war take place and note what will happen in this country. Wilson could no more hold this people at bay than could Madison in 1812 or McKinley in 1898. The Democrats here would be among the first to demand action.

This is no time to multiply opportunities for international disputes, for when our honor is at stake not all the powers of President or Congress could stay the sword of the Nation. Hence the importance of our keeping our balance at this juncture.

Before we abdicate our rights as Members of this body to carry out the capricious wish of a Cabinet member, or even the head of the Nation, we should weigh the consequences of our acts and measure the forces now at play upon the sea, which can not be overlooked from the standpoint of our national welfare. Our international situation is strained by our Mexican situation, largely due to a lack of policy.

The open-door policy in China is seriously threatened by Japan's aggression, and, as it appears, with the permission of her ally. The situation with Europe, in view of the counter-decrees of the belligerents, ought surely to open our eyes to the necessity of the most careful guarding of the rights of this House.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield six minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH].

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, in the time allotted to me I should like to have the Clerk read an article written by Capt. Wilson I. Davenny, of Pontiac, Mich., entitled "Glory-Crowned Gettysburg."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk reads as follows:

GLORY-CROWNED GETTYSBURG.

(By Capt. Wilson I. Davenny.)

"Gettysburg is a thrice-hallowed name. On the historic days in July half a century ago the Federal forces under Meade and the gallant and faithful followers of Lee mingled their sacrificial blood in the baptism of that most memorable field. And here, on a November day that was made forever notable by speech, Abraham Lincoln delivered his immortal address dedicating a portion of that field as a final resting place for the men who had yielded their lives that the Nation should survive. And within a lifetime more than 50,000 of the men who had been grim, determined actors in a death-inviting drama are met again upon the same consecrated soil and under the scorching rays of a July sun, but not in hostile ranks; not as foes, but as friends. The days of conflict and carnage are done, and the eyes that then were sighted along a glistening rifle barrel now dimmed by mists of years seek and meet the responsive and full forgiving glances of an erstwhile foe. The chasm of half a century is bridged. The asperities of years ago are submerged in an unbidden flood of mutual tears. The full and throbbing hearts of the veterans now beat in unison. There is no North, there is no South.

"The actual participants in the war of the sixties have themselves sealed the record of their privations and sacrificial suffering. Let no man open the book but to learn the splendid lessons of devotion to duty, as each man saw it, whichever section of our now united and common country may have claimed his service.

"It is worthy of serious reflection on this semicentennial anniversary of the third day's battle at Gettysburg that it is as true as when the 'great commoner' paid his tribute to the fallen sons of the North that while honoring the dead we should cherish a reawakened interest in 'that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion,' and that we 'highly resolve * * * that the Government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth.' And in making this high resolve let us clearly understand that it is no idle pledge, but a dedication to civic endeavor, social uplift, and the advancement of practical patriotism. With the conspicuous inequalities in our social fabric, incident to the accretions in recent years of great wealth in the hands of a few and the daily exposures of venality and dishonest methods under our political system, the question, 'Whether or not a nation dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal' is still biding its solution. There is still need for a sturdy, uncompromising, high-minded, patriotic citizenship, and there must be enough of it to give healthful direction to the all-encompassing commercial spirit of the times, if the American democracy is to endure as a permanent institution.

"God grant that the lessons of glory-crowned Gettysburg, thrice consecrated to duty, patriotism, and peace, shall strengthen and sustain the pillars of the Republic." [Applause.]

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I yield back any time that I may have left.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back two minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CARAWAY].

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to continue the remarks which some days ago I delivered on the subject of rural credits, and I wish to put into the Record some statements touching this subject.

There are 12,000,000 farmers in these United States. Their aggregate wealth, including all property, is \$41,000,000,000. They owe \$6,000,000,000. Their farms are mortgaged for \$3,000,000,000 of this sum. Annually they pay interest amounting to \$510,000,000, an average interest rate of 8½ per cent. Statistics show they can pay only 5½ per cent and prosper. They should pay, therefore, if they are to prosper, instead of \$510,000,000 annually for interest, only \$330,000,000 on their borrowed money. In other words, there is wrung from the farmers an annual interest charge of \$180,000,000 in excess of what they can afford to pay. Industrial 5 per cent bonds now sell at par. Panama 3 per cent bonds are quoted at 99. The farmer, notwithstanding he produces all the wealth, and in the last analysis possesses it, pays 8½ per cent interest. This he can not afford to do, and under just economic laws would not be required to do. For that reason they demand of us, their Representatives in the American Congress, and have the right to demand of us, the enactment of a law to right this wrong. I myself am glad to acknowledge this obligation, and here and now pledge myself to that service. When we shall

have dealt justly with the farmers of this country they will have had their interest rate for agricultural enterprises reduced from $8\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, the present rate, to not to exceed $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, and thereby retain for themselves and their families \$300,000,000 annually, which they now unjustly are compelled to pay as excess interest on this borrowed money. This is the sum they now pay to a system which is not adapted to their needs and which the enactment of a just rural credit law would avoid.

Rural credits, as the name implies, is a system of credits devised to meet the needs of agriculture. No other subject is of such importance, not only to the people directly affected, but to all the American people, the producers and consumers of farm products that now pay tribute to commercial banking. On the 23d day of January I made a short speech in this Chamber briefly calling attention to a bill I had introduced on the 12th day of January of this year, proposing a rural credits system for this country. In the short time then available a full explanation of its provisions was impossible, although the bill itself is extremely brief and simple. Since that time, I am pleased to say, the legislative committee of the National Farmers' Union met in the city of Washington and indorsed this bill and made it the concrete demand of the farmers' union of the United States for rural credits. Inasmuch as the system is designed primarily for farmers, they should be consulted with reference to the provisions of any proposed legislation. Since the success or failure of the system would more directly affect farmers than any other class of people no legislation touching this subject should be enacted that does not meet with their entire approval. To deny them the right to have enacted a law the provisions of which they approve is to arrogate to ourselves a superior intelligence or to deny to the farmers the intelligence to understand and comprehend their own needs. None of us, I am sure, is willing to assume that attitude, and therefore let me hope all who are sincerely desirous of the enactment of a just and adequate rural credits bill will join in the advocacy of this measure. I have in it no pride of authorship. Embodied in this plan are the ideas and ideals of the National Farmers' Union, the organization that has done as much or more than any other for the advancement of farmers. In its provisions are crystallized the labors of the best years and most devoted efforts of such men as the Hon. Charles S. Barrett, the president of the national association, and men of his cabinet, as well as others, and I am happy in being authorized by them to say its provisions meet with their approval and the approval of those for whom they speak, and that its enactment would free the farmers from bondage to a system from which they have long suffered. To show in what complete accord its provisions are with the demands of farmers as expressed through their organizations upon this subject, I will have inserted in the RECORD the remarks delivered before a committee of Congress some months ago by H. S. Mobley, State president of the Farmers' Union of Arkansas, and in passing I want to pay to him a deserved tribute. No man more accurately and sympathetically reflects the hopes and aspirations of the people for whom he speaks or expresses those views in more clear and forceful language.

This bill seeks to accomplish four things, or rather to accomplish one thing directly, and indirectly three others. The first object sought, of course, is to procure for farmers long-time loans at a rate of interest so low that agriculture can afford to pay that rate and prosper. The second object, and not less important, is to make it unprofitable, and therefore improbable, that large landed estates should be acquired; certainly a most desirable result, for no country has ever prospered as it should where the lands are held by a few and the great mass of the people are tenants, not that tenants are not good men, but the very condition under which they labor prevents them from developing the best there is within them, and withholds from their families the fruits of their toil.

A third object sought is to enable the farmers to receive the benefits of this act without at the same time disturbing local interest rates and thereby destroying local banking and commercial business, the importance of which is so obvious that no comment is needed.

The fourth is by permitting a loan of 25 per cent of the value of the improvements on the land to encourage those residing upon the land to erect adequate buildings and other improvements thereon.

Section 2 of this act provides that there shall be created in the Department of the Treasury a commission to be known as a rural credits commission to be comprised of five men. Three of them are to be farmers who have no other occupations, and two to be men of large affairs. The entire system, its development and operation, is intrusted to their wisdom and discretion.

Plenary powers are given them to make such rules and regulations as will best conserve the objects sought to be attained. Three farmers are named on this board, because it is necessary, in my judgment, to have men whose sympathies are solely with the farmer, and whose experiences have made them fully acquainted with all of his conditions, and by that means keep ever in view the object for which this act is proposed; that is, the betterment of the farmers of this country. The other two members are to be men of large affairs, because expert training and knowledge that goes with the handling of large business interests will enable them at all times to promote the sale of these securities, and to direct the investments of the amortization fund so that the best results from this fund may be obtained.

Section 3 fixes their tenure of office at five years, the object being to make it impossible that this commission shall be swept out of power at each change of administration. It is hoped that this commission shall always be preserved from partisan politics, and that fitness for the duties to be performed shall be the sole reason for making these appointments. The salary is \$6,000 each per year, and is to be paid out of the Treasury of the United States.

Section 5 gives the commission the power to select its agents and to employ all necessary assistants. No reference is made in the section to civil service, because it would doubtless happen that men most qualified to deal with problems confronting the farmer would be less able to pass a technical examination. We all know that it frequently happens that the ability to spell correctly and to recite dry facts of history are indicative not of executive capacity, but are merely the acquirements of one who has no inclination to labor and no ability to rise.

Section 6 makes postmasters the agents of the Government for performing whatever services may be required of them touching this measure without additional compensation. The reason for selecting these men is that they are already in the employ of the Government; they are men of ability and honor; they are selected from the people, and are familiar with the conditions in the locality where they serve. No additional compensation is granted them, because the duties are light and involve more of honor than labor, and for the further reason that the expense attendant upon a loan should be made as light and as little burdensome as possible to the borrower. All of us owe a duty to the public and should be willing to render some services without direct compensation, and I know this great body of patriotic men will be willing to perform whatever duties may be required of them by this commission without additional recompense.

Section 7 defines a "farmer" as one who actually resides upon a farm and is engaged in the business of producing agricultural products. The benefits of this act are extended to everyone of that class and denied to all others. It also fixes periods for which loans may be made at 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, and 30 years, and provides, further, that a farmer may pay his loan at any time after the expiration of five years, or may pay \$100 or any multiple thereof after that period at any interest-paying period, and upon any sum so paid the interest thereon shall cease. Section 7 further provides that any farmer who is entitled to a loan at all under the provisions of this bill, shall, if he desires, receive a loan of not less than 50 per cent of the value of his lands and not less than 25 per cent of the value of the improvements thereon. This provision is arbitrary as to the amount the farmer shall be entitled to receive, if entitled to receive anything, only so far as it fixes the minimum that he may be permitted to borrow. If he is entitled to more, the commission may extend it. It leaves within the power of the borrower to determine the number of years which his loan should run. However, it is not to be less than 5 years nor more than 30 years, but at any time within that period he may terminate it at his pleasure. The object in fixing a loan value upon his improvements is obvious. While 40 acres of land, or any other number, will produce as much corn or as many bushels of wheat or pounds of cotton with a shed in which a family may exist and without any shelter for live stock, yet it does not meet the requirements nor the desires of the producers of America's wealth. Therefore, not only to encourage the erection of comfortable homes and adequate outbuildings, but to make possible these improvements a loan value for that purpose is provided in this measure.

Section 8 provides that deeds of trust or mortgages shall name the chairman of the commission as trustee for the use and benefit of the United States of America. This instrument shall name the amount sought to be borrowed, the number of years the loan is to run, but leaves the interest rate blank. This provision is for the purpose of permitting these evidences of indebtedness to be sold at par to the one who is willing to pay par therefor and accept the lowest rate of interest procurable. This

section further provides the manner in which the borrower shall furnish evidences of his title. An abstract of some recognized agency shall be furnished, but examined by officers appointed by the commission, and without expense to the borrower. This provision, in my judgment, is necessary in order to make it possible for small borrowers to acquire a loan without having the expense incident thereto made prohibitive. The section further provides that in those States where the Torrens system of registration of land titles shall have been adopted, the certificate of the State shall be evidence of title. This would rid the farmer of the necessity of procuring an abstract, and the costs incident thereto would be eliminated. Of course, this will arouse the antagonism of those who are commercially engaged in preparing abstracts of title or of attorneys who pass upon titles, but it will hasten the day when that system of registering land titles shall be adopted in every State of this Union.

Section 9 provides the method by which the applicant for a loan puts into motion the machinery to accomplish that purpose. He shall first apply to his local postmaster and procure the necessary blanks. He shall execute these blanks under oath, setting forth the amount of the loan he seeks, the security he has to offer, and the purposes for which he seeks the loan, the number of years he desires it to run, and all additional information that the commission may desire and direct. Upon receipt of this application the postmaster shall appoint two committees, of three men each, and the first named of each shall act as chairman of his committee. The first committee shall consist of three farmers, who reside in the immediate vicinity of the land upon which the loan is sought and who are familiar with it as a farming proposition. They shall make a secret appraisalment of both the lands and the improvements, but separate. This appraisalment shall be made under oath and filed with the postmaster. The second committee shall consist of men of affairs who are familiar not only with the value of the lands but are acquainted with the farmer applying for the loan, and who will know the general conditions in the community at large, whether land values are advancing or depreciating, and other things necessary to be known by the commission to determine the hazard of the loan. This appraisalment shall be made in secret and under oath and filed with the postmaster. Upon receipt of the two appraisalments the postmaster, together with the chairmen of the two committees, shall open the two appraisalments and shall revise and make out a just and fair appraisalment of the lands, and also the improvements, which shall be forwarded to the commission at Washington, together with all additional information the commission may desire. The commission at Washington, upon receipt of this appraisalment, shall determine the amount, if any, of the loan to which the applicant is entitled and return to the postmaster the necessary deeds of trust to be executed by the applicant. This shall name the time for which the loan is to run and the amount, but leave blank the interest rate, because the interest is to be determined by the sale of the security. This deed of trust shall designate the chairman of the commission as trustee for the use and benefit of the United States of America. Upon receipt of this deed of trust, duly executed, the commission shall sell at private or public sale this evidence of indebtedness at par within the city of Washington or elsewhere, as in its judgment the most advantageous terms for the borrower may be procured, and at the lowest rate of interest procurable. The borrower shall pay the rate of interest for which his security is sold and at the times specified therein, and, in addition thereto, shall pay whatever per cent as an amortization fund the commission in its judgment may fix.

Section 10 provides that this amortization fund shall be a common fund; that is, it is the fund from which the interest due upon any loan, when due, shall be paid, and also from which shall be paid the principal of any maturing obligation. The object of making it a common fund is obvious. It will enable the commission at any time to pay any interest payments when due, or any loan upon its maturity, and therefore will make the security more desirable, and the interest rate the same in every State in this Union, because the lender can have no interest in the location of the lands or to whom the money he loans shall be paid. He merely files his voucher with any postmaster of the first, second, or third class, or any national bank, and the same will be cashed, and in the same manner his loan at its maturity will be paid. Thus no one will hesitate to loan money to one who applies through this system, and the failure of crops, the death of the borrower, or any other misfortune or disaster can not delay the payment of the interest or the cancellation of the loan itself at its maturity.

Section 11 provides the manner of foreclosing a mortgage when the borrower shall have failed to meet his interest payments or the payment of his obligation upon its maturity. The

land shall be seized through a foreclosure procedure had in the district court for the district wherein the lands are situated. All officers of said court are made the agents of this commission, and to serve without additional pay. Any time during the pending of the suit the borrower may pay his arrears, and the suit will be dismissed, or if he fails to do so, and his lands are sold, he has one year from date of sale in which to redeem the same. The sale, under the provisions of this bill, is not a sale in the sense that the obligation shall be paid in its entirety, but only its arrears, so that the tenure of the loan upon the land for a period of years shall not be disturbed. The purchaser at said sale shall merely pay the sum in arrears, together with what costs, if any, may be accrued to this amortization fund and assume the obligations of the original borrower. Whatever in addition to this that he may bid for the land shall be paid to the holder of the equity therein.

Section 12, in my judgment, is the most important section in the bill, and one against which the most bitter opposition will be waged. In this section the Government guarantees the payment of these loans, interest and principal. In this section of the bill the Government does for rural credits what it did for commercial banking in the Federal reserve act; that is, guarantees the observance of all its contracts and the redemption of all its obligations. This will make a farmer's loan as much to be desired by the investing public as a bond of these United States, and in many respects more to be desired, because in addition to the credit of these United States he has the real estate of the borrower, which is the best security that can be offered, and in this country, where prices are constantly increasing, this security will be more valuable as the years go by. If section 12 is permitted to remain in the bill—and without it the bill should not pass—there is no reason to believe that the rate of interest which a farmer will be compelled to pay will ever be in excess of 3½ per cent. Industrial securities, such as the bonds of the Pennsylvania Railway system, are now selling at par at that rate, and the obligations of this Government have sold at par, with an interest rate below that, and, therefore, in my judgment, the maximum interest rate would not exceed this, and might be considerably lower. When farmers shall enjoy the benefits of this provision and procure capital with which to operate on long-time loans at not exceeding that rate, not only will the farmers of this country prosper, but all the people who consume the products of the farm will, to an equal extent, reap the benefits of this act.

Section 13 limits the amount of a loan to any one person to \$5,000. The object sought by this limitation is to make it impossible for one to build up or maintain large landed estates under the favorable conditions provided for borrowers under the provisions of this act. Were there no limitations it would be not only possible but profitable for men taking advantage of the low rate of interest procurable under the provisions of this bill to acquire large landed estates and thereby defeat the very object of the bill, which is to enable the men who till the soil to become the owners thereof. It provides that where lands upon which a loan has been procured shall pass into the hands of some one not a bona fide farmer, under the provisions of this bill said loan shall become due and payable. If this were not true, it would be possible by use of dummies for one to acquire loans under the provisions of this act, while in fact he was not entitled thereto. It further provides that where anyone shall acquire lands on which mortgages in excess of \$5,000 procured under this act rest the excess of \$5,000 shall become due and payable. This is also a provision to prevent accumulation in the hands of one man large estates purchased with money secured under the advantages of the low rate of interest made possible by this bill.

The entire intention of the bill is that it shall assist farmers to become the owners of their own homes; that those who till the soil shall own it. It is as necessary to shield farmers from the greed of land speculators as from the exactions of an unjust economic system. The country rests, and must rest, for its security and preservation upon the farmers of this country, and conditions must be made possible whereby every man who farms shall own the lands he tills. When this bill shall have become a law that condition will have been created and that result will follow. Therefore this bill should receive the unqualified support of all who have at heart the interests and the desire to protect from unjust conditions that class that founded and must preserve this Government and the free institutions we enjoy.

A bill (H. R. 20841) to provide for a low rate of interest and long-time loans in aid of agriculture, and for other purposes.

Whereas experience has demonstrated that a banking system suitable and adequate for the transaction of commercial banking is unsuited and inadequate for agriculture; and
Whereas the rate of interest that prevails in commercial transactions is in excess of that agriculture can pay; and

Whereas it is desired to establish a system whereby those bona fide engaged in agriculture may obtain a loan at a low rate of interest and long-time payment; and

Whereas it is not desired to disturb local banking conditions; and
Whereas it is in the interest of agriculture and good citizenship that large landed estates be not acquired; and
Whereas those who actually reside upon the land and till the soil should be the owners thereof: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That the short title of this act shall be "A rural credits act."

SEC. 2. That there is hereby created in the Department of the Treasury at Washington, D. C., a commission to be known as a rural credits commission, said commission to be composed of five members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. These commissioners shall be selected from the various sections of the United States, and three of whom shall be actual bona fide farmers, who reside upon their farms and have no other occupations. Two shall be men of business affairs and recognized financial ability. The said rural credits commission shall herein be referred to as the commission. They shall elect one of their members chairman.

SEC. 3. That at first said commissioners shall be appointed for one, two, three, four, and five years, respectively, and after that their terms of office shall be for five years each unless removed by the President for cause. The salary shall be \$6,000 each, payable quarterly.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall assign them rooms for the conduct of their business, and they shall have power to appoint clerks and employ assistants that may be necessary for the transaction of the business of the department.

SEC. 5. That said commission shall have power to prescribe all rules and regulations necessary for carrying into effect the provisions of this act and for the conduct of the business of the department.

SEC. 6. That all postmasters throughout the United States and Territories thereof and the District of Columbia, for the purpose of carrying this act into effect and for the proper conduct of its business, shall be the agents of the commission and perform whatever services may be required of them without pay.

SEC. 7. That the purpose of this act shall be to enable farmers to procure long-time loans at low rate of interest to purchase farms or to develop and extend their agricultural productiveness. The word "farmer" as herein used shall mean one who actually resides upon his farm and is engaged in the business of farming, and the benefits of this bill shall be applicable to farmers residing in any State or Territory of the United States of America or the District of Columbia. The loans herein contemplated shall run in series of 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, and 30 years, at the option of the borrower. Interest to be payable annually. The terms of such loan shall provide that at any interest-paying date beyond five years the borrower shall have the option to pay the principal, or to make payment of \$100, or any multiple thereof, and upon such payment being made the interest on the amount so paid shall cease. Payment may be made at any post office or national bank. No person shall be entitled to a loan unless he actually resides upon his farm, or shall use the loan in payment of lands upon which he shall immediately fix his home. The amount of the loan shall be determined by the commission herein created, except anyone applying who is entitled to the loan shall, if he desires, receive as a loan as much as 50 per cent of the actual value of his lands and 25 per cent of the actual value of the improvements thereon, and as much more as may in the judgment of the commission be safe and prudent to extend him.

SEC. 8. That all securities or deeds of trust executed by anyone to secure a loan hereunder shall be made payable to the chairman of the commission as the trustee for the United States of America. Said instrument shall recite the amount of the loan and date of maturity, but shall not name the rate of interest to be paid thereon. Said instrument must be executed by the borrower according to forms of the State or Territory in which the lands are situated and in conformity with the rules and regulations prescribed by the commission. In addition to executing the said instrument herein referred to the borrower shall execute notes with coupons attached for interest periods named in said deed of trust and in the form that may be prescribed by the commission. These coupons are redeemable or payable at any national bank or any post office of the first, second, or third class. These notes, securities, coupons, and obligations and funds shall not be subject to taxation, municipal, State, or national. The title to said lands shall be shown by a suitable abstract, which shall be forwarded with the application for the loan, except in those States where the Torrens system may prevail, and in those States the certificate of the State shall be sufficient evidence of title. There shall be proper officers appointed for the examination of titles, for which services no fee shall be charged.

SEC. 9. That a farmer desiring to avail himself of the provisions of this act shall file with the local postmaster a written application under oath, setting forth the security he has to offer, the amount of the loan he desires, and the purposes for which he desires it, and such other facts as may be required by the commission. Whereupon the postmaster shall appoint two committees, consisting of three members each; the first named of each shall act as chairman of his committee. The first committee shall consist of three farmers residing in the immediate vicinity of the farm upon which the loan is desired, and who shall be familiar with its value, and they shall make an appraisal of the value of the lands and the improvements thereon separately. Said appraisements shall be under oath and secret, and shall be filed with the postmaster appointing said committee. The second committee shall consist of three men of affairs who are familiar with the land and improvements upon which the loan is sought and with the general conditions in that vicinity, as to whether values of real estate are advancing or declining, and whether the applicant is a progressive farmer or otherwise. They shall likewise appraise the farm and improvements and give whatever other information may be necessary to determine the hazard of the loan. These appraisements shall likewise be secret and made under oath and filed with the postmaster appointing said committees. When these appraisements are received by the postmaster, the postmaster and the chairmen of the two committees shall proceed to open the appraisements and to make therefrom a just and accurate appraisal of the property, both lands and improvements, and transmit the same to the chairman of the said commission at Washington, together with whatever other information may be necessary with reference to the applicant in the loan sought, to enable the commission to determine the amount to be loaned, if any. When the application is received and approved by the said commission, it shall cause to be forwarded to the postmaster from whom it was received the necessary notes and instruments to be executed by the borrower, who shall execute them in the manner prescribed by the commission and return to said commission. Thereupon said notes and instruments

for the loan shall be sold in the open market for par at the lowest rate of interest procurable. The proceeds of said sale shall be transmitted to the borrower. The borrower shall not only pay the rate of interest agreed upon in said sale, but shall pay whatever per cent may be necessary for the amortization of said loan at maturity thereof. The per cent for amortization shall be fixed by the commission.

SEC. 10. That the moneys paid in under amortization herein provided for shall be a trust fund available for the payment of any interest or principal that may be due and unpaid on any loan made under the provisions of this act, and shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States or put out at interest, as may be determined by said commission.

SEC. 11. That if any borrower shall make default in the payment of principal or interest under the provisions of his loan, then, under such rules and regulations as the commission may prescribe, his lands shall be seized and sold subject to the terms of the loan, and for the purpose of said seizure and sale suit may be brought in the name of the commission, and all district attorneys are hereby authorized and commanded to prosecute said suits without fee. Said suits shall be in the United States district court for the district in which the lands are situated. From the proceeds of said sale all costs shall be first paid, and accrued interest and principal, if due, and the residue, if any, shall be paid to the borrower. Real estate sold under the provisions of this act may be redeemed from said sale by anyone holding the equity therein within one year from the date of sale.

SEC. 12. That the United States of America shall guarantee the payment of all interest and principal of loans procured under the provisions of this act.

SEC. 13. That no loan shall be in excess of \$5,000. If the premises mortgaged under the provisions of this act shall pass into the ownership of anyone who is not a bona fide farmer, the indebtedness shall at once become due and payable. If anyone shall acquire lands upon which there is a loan under the provisions of this act in excess of \$5,000, the excess of \$5,000 shall at once become due and payable.

SEC. 14. That this act shall be in force from and after its passage.

The remarks of H. S. Mobley are as follows:

In my argument before your committee at various times I have outlined the idea which we farmers have of the reasons why a rural-credit system separate from the commercial banking system is necessary. I do not suppose it is necessary for me to go into that at this time. The plan which we propose for rural credits is different from anything which has been presented to the committee; that is, that I have knowledge of.

One objection to all the plans which have been presented to you is that they propose, in some measure at least, that the source of the credit to be extended to the farmer is to be derived from money which is payable on demand. Not one of them, so far as I am aware, proposes to bring, in an available way, in reach of the borrowing farmer real investment money. Another general objection to these plans is that, almost without exception, they would bind the farmer to the necessity of paying for his investment loans the rate of commercial interest prevailing in the State where the borrower resides. And, gentlemen, these two things are fundamentally wrong, and we are prepared to say that a rural-credit plan providing for long-time loans, whose source is demand capital and charging commercial interest, instead of being a help to the farmer, would be a detriment; and if this is the only kind of rural credits which your committee or the Congress and Senate of the United States will enact on behalf of the farmer, we believe it would be better to drop the whole matter and leave things as they are.

Our plan, in the concrete, is about as follows:

Any actual farmer to be permitted to approach some officer of the Federal Government in his immediate locality—possibly the postmaster—and on prepared blanks make application for a loan on his land for either part payment on his farm or to discharge a previous lien, the Federal officer to have authority to appoint two sets of appraisers, of three men each, each set to operate independently of the other and to be appointed by the Federal officer at separate times, so that one set of appraisers will not be officially in existence at the time the other set makes its appraisal; no member of the two sets of appraisers to be related to the proposed borrower nor connected with him by business relations or otherwise; the first set to be three actual farmers who have had a personal knowledge of the land offered as security and the one asking it for a period of five years, they to make their appraisal of the value of the property and to reveal nothing to anyone concerning the result of their finding, but to make a sworn report in writing and file it, sealed, with the local Federal officer; after their report, this officer to appoint another set of appraisers, who are to be men of affairs in the business relations of the community, they to make an appraisal according to their judgment and report to the Federal officer in like manner; the Federal officer then to call in the chairmen of the two appraising committees, and they three to open the sealed reports of the two committees and make a final appraisal and recommendation for the loan on the property.

There to be established in the Treasury at Washington a commission of 12 men, to be known as the rural-credit commission, 7 of these men to be actual farmers who have had five years continuous experience in deriving their living from the soil immediately previous to their appointment, the other 5 men to be men of affairs in the financial life of the Nation. Their salaries and expenses to be paid by the United States Government.

The local Federal officer will report to this commission the recommendation of his appraising committees, and this Federal commission, if it be satisfied that the recommendation is for a reasonable and secure loan on the property, to cause to be filed out a form of mortgage, which shall be returned to the local officer for acceptance and signature by the borrowing farmer. This mortgage to be then returned to the Federal commission. When the commission shall have accumulated a sufficient number of these mortgages, they to offer them for sale, with the guaranty of the Government behind them, at par or face value, and at the least rate of interest for which they will be accepted by the investing public.

When such mortgages are sold the sums derived from their sale to be forwarded to the local Federal officer or officers and paid over on receipt to the borrowing farmer or farmers, and the date upon which the borrower receipts for the money shall be the date from which the mortgage is to begin, and the rate of interest at which the Federal commission has sold the mortgage shall be the rate of interest on the mortgage. The commission to collect, in addition, at each interest period, a percentage for amortization; and in addition to this, the commission to collect annually from each borrower a sum of not to exceed one-tenth of 1 per cent, which is to be held in the United States Treasury as a guaranty against loss on the part of the Government for its guaranty of these mortgages.

I am aware that here the objection will be raised that the Government should not guarantee these mortgages; that it is unprecedented, etc.; but if you will consider that these loans would be made at not to exceed 50 per cent of the value of the property, that each year a certain per cent of the face value of the mortgage will be paid by the borrower, and that in addition there will be collected from all the borrowers in the United States a sum of money each year which at the end of a 35-year period, at one-tenth of 1 per cent, will amount to a 3½ per cent guaranty deposit in the Treasury, it will be seen that there can be no possible risk to the Government in guaranteeing these mortgages. I believe I will ask you to consider this a little more fully. The Government will have as a guaranty two dollars for one in property value; it will also have the appreciated value of the property from year to year (and no one can doubt that most farm lands will constantly appreciate from year to year); it will also have the amortization paid by the borrower reducing the face value of the mortgage, and, in addition, this 3½ per cent at the end of a 35-year period.

If this system of appraisal and security does not constitute an absolutely safe business deal, it is impossible for us to conceive of one.

Now, gentlemen, we have presented the outline of our plan, and desire to make some further explanations and arguments in behalf of it. The kernel of the whole matter of rural credits for investment is that the loans must be for a long time and the source of these loans be investment and not demand capital. All investment loans for agriculture should carry the amortization feature, and the most necessary feature of the whole is that they should bear a rate of interest considerably below the commercial rate.

Now, as I have said, I have not found among any of the plans any that proposed rural credits in line with this idea. Gentlemen, agriculture can not pay commercial rates of interest nor prosper under short-time loans, nor long-time loans derived from demand capital. As evidence of this last, banks do not, as a rule, seek to lend the permitted 20 per cent of their capital on long-time loans. The plan which we here propose meets all the demands above set forth.

This plan does not bring the necessarily low interest of agricultural loans into competition locally through neighborhood cooperations with the commercial interest charged by the local banks. This should be gravely considered by you.

Strong emphasis is laid in most of the plans proposed before you on some form of local cooperation among farmers of a financial nature before they can secure any form of rural credits. If local cooperative banks are to be our only source of farm loans, they must compete with local commercial banks, not only as regards the rate of interest but also with regard to the use of local capital. Therefore these cooperative banks of a local nature, being more or less in competition with local commercial banks for local capital, would have a tendency not to lower but to actually raise the local rate of interest. And this further result would follow that the higher rate of commercial rate of interest would attract the local money supply, and would not only serve to raise interest locally on all classes of loans but also would attract local capital more to commercial loans by reason of an increased interest which could be paid by money used for commercial purposes in that locality.

And, again, local cooperation by farmers in order to obtain investment loans is not wanted by the American farmers any more than by American merchants. There is no more reason for the American farmer being compelled to cooperate with his fellow farmers in order to obtain a loan of investment nature on land of known value than there is for cooperation among merchants to obtain loans of a commercial nature on their property of known value or on their credit.

This cooperative feature would tend to destroy the incentive for the individual to build up his own credit according to the laws of credit, individual wealth, trade ability and integrity, and have a tendency to communize him. I am speaking now, of course, of land loans and not personal credit for purely agricultural productive purposes.

It may seem strange that a nation-wide organization purporting to teach and practice cooperation should object to a cooperative system of rural credits. But this is only apparent. Those among us who have studied cooperation realize that, broadly speaking and as applied to agricultural efforts, according to American ideals, it is to be divided into two kinds—one may be called productive cooperation and the other distributive. Now, productive cooperation may not necessarily be communism, but it is at least communistic and tends toward communism. The organization which I have the honor to represent before you has in no way any inclination to enter into productive cooperation, but confines its efforts solely to the advancement of the idea of a distributive cooperation among its fellows. It presumes that the individuals composing its membership will be able to provide their own homes, tools, land, or, that is to say, their own investments, according to the capacity of the individual, and that the individual will use his own judgment as regards his investments and his production. After he has produced a commodity of a kind, the farmers' union undertakes to teach him to cooperate to find a market; but even in that cooperation the individualistic idea is steadfastly maintained so that the individual among us producing the less number or amount of commodities or inferior commodities can not derive any benefit through his cooperation with his fellow cooperators, who have been able to produce a greater amount of marketable commodities of a better grade. In other words, we are purely an American farmers' cooperative organization and scarcely at all tinged with the idea of productive or communistic cooperation, which can not but tend to bring about a leveling of individualistic character among its membership; but, as I have intimated, we strive constantly through our cooperative ideas of a distributive nature to bring out and develop the very best in each individual among us by a competitive system of cooperation. Therefore, we are opposed to cooperative land banks or cooperation of any nature that tends even to transplant to American soil the peasantizing and communistic farm cooperation ideas and practices of the European countries.

Our plan for rural credits places the individual on his own resources for a loan on his own property without involving either the limited or unlimited liability of his neighbors. But there is in this plan a cooperation which is American in its nature; it is not local, but is Nation wide. Each borrower pays a small assessment to the Federal commission as a guaranty for every other borrower, and after all our plan is cooperative, but does not affect the individual nor his personal ability to obtain a loan perceptibly. And, involving as it does all the borrowers in a national liability, constitutes in our plan a far better security for a loan than could possibly be had under any system of local cooperation where only a few men relatively stand liable or as security for loans in a locality. The whole guaranty fund distributed among all the borrowers in the Nation assembled at one point as guaranty for all loans would certainly be better security than any local cooperative plan could offer. This plan certainly would act to stabilize

all the loans, whereas under local cooperation some loans would be amply secured and some possibly would not, which would tend to depreciate the value of all farm loans and thereby tend to increase the rate of interest at which they could be secured.

We advocate a limit to the amount that can be borrowed by any farmer in this way. If the amount is not limited, this condition could arise: The large landholders, by reason of better business ability, could borrow more easily than the man who is perhaps not so well informed and who is occupying all of his time in a struggle to support a family and pay for a home, and the result would be that while the rural-credit law would be ostensibly for the help of such home-owning farmers it would become, in effect, a real help toward extending landlordism and syndicalism in farms throughout the country, and the genuine purpose of the rural-credit law would be defeated. Also, in this connection, a rural-credit law which does not actually provide for a rate of interest below the commercial rate would aid to this end, since the more competent men of larger means and greater ability in handling money could necessarily make greater profits and could, therefore, pay a higher rate of interest.

As I have intimated, our plan preserves:

First. The individuality of the borrowing farmer and does not tend in any way to communize him.

Second. Is cooperative at last, but not directly in a communistic or joint-liable sense.

Third. Its guaranty is distributed over so wide a field as to be not burdensome on any borrower.

Fourth. Its security or guaranty is better, as I have intimated, than any local guaranty of a cooperative nature could possibly be.

Fifth. The system of appraisal can not but arrive at a secure valuation and eliminate all reasonable doubts as to the value of the property as security for the loan.

Sixth. The Federal commission, composed as it is of actual farmers and business men, can act as a safeguard to farmers in other matters of a national nature pertaining to agriculture, somewhat after the plan of the German Landwirtschafts-rat.

Seventh. This plan insures a low rate of interest on agricultural loans by using the Government to bring the owner of investment money and the small borrowing farmer together without the intermediary of any profit-taking form of business whatever. The big point in this is that the small borrower could reach the investor of long-time money with perfect ease, whereas no plan which I have heretofore heard proposed offers to do this nor to provide a real method for lowering interest on agricultural loans.

Eighth. This plan of obtaining money at low interest would not affect the local commercial rate of interest in any way.

Ninth. Does not admit of the possibility of loss to the Government that all other plans I have heard proposed seemed to.

Tenth. Does not use any demand money for long-time loans.

Eleventh. Would relieve local banks of their present necessity of striving to carry the long-time loans of their communities on demand money.

Twelfth. But would permit local banks to use all their capital for commercial or personal credit or for productive loans, thus going a long way toward providing a means for personal credits in the community where much money was borrowed by the farmers for investment.

Thirteenth. The money loaned as we have outlined on farms in any community would largely find its way into local banks of that community, and thus increase their resources for commercial and personal credit uses.

Fourteenth. A large factor in this plan is that it gives efficient aid, as I have said, to the small borrower to reach the investor of long-time money and borrow for a low interest.

In conclusion I wish to say that the theory of all law, as I understand it, is that every man is equal before the law, both as to its opportunities and to its restrictions; that an opportunity offered by a legal enactment may seem to be fair and open to all, but this fact is true, that wherever the law offers men opportunities those men of best business ability and resources are the ones who profit most and necessarily the great masses of less resourceful men profit less.

American farmers have as much ability as any other class of our people, but our ability is not usually what is termed business ability. Our occupation consumes our interests and ability in other directions than those of a strictly commercial business nature. Therefore, when we are left to compete with commercial business of better business resources and ability than ourselves, we always stand to fall to get our share of the opportunities, which, in theory, we should share equally with others, because the other classes are better trained and skilled in business than are we and can secure to themselves the benefits more readily.

Therefore we farmers here and now ask this Government to cure in this matter of rural credits this disadvantage in finances under which we labor. In substance, we ask the Government to act as our middle man and create for us this opportunity of securing credit based on investment money and to bring us in touch with the investors under such statutory legalization as will secure to us that which we are unable to secure for ourselves in competition with these more resourceful and better trained men. This, gentlemen, in substance, is our plea, and we feel that the more serious consideration you give to this subject the more benefit you will confer upon American farmers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to direct my attention, first, to the statement that there are pensioners now living outside the United States numbering 5,163, and to the amendment which has been offered to continue the pensions to those only who are now and continue to be citizens of the United States.

I do not understand that our liberal pension laws were enacted as a matter of inducement or reward for anything that was to occur in the future, but they were intended as a fair

remembrance and evidence of gratitude on the part of this Government for services which had already been rendered by those who took part in the preservation of this great Government of ours. So that it matters not, it seems to me, where they live, or what their occupation may be, or what their present allegiance may be, that if they or those whom they represent upon the pension rolls did perform the service for this Government, then their obligation and contract with this Government is complete, and no penalty should be inflicted upon them because for any reason they see fit to live under another flag or in another land. [Applause.]

I call attention to the fact that of the 5,163 members on the pension roll residing outside of the United States 2,692 reside in our neighbor country Canada, 504 live in the fatherland of Germany, 415 live in the little green isle that furnished a greater percentage of fighting blood for the northern army based upon its area and its citizenship than any other part of the world outside of the United States itself. [Applause.] These three divisions contain 70 per cent of all our pensioners abroad.

There are many reasons, perhaps, why the old mother in Ireland or the old father in Germany or the dependents in Canada should be permitted to live where they are while we continue to simply carry out the contract which this Government made with them or their representatives. Nay, more, Mr. Chairman; there is a most important reason why this House should under no circumstances penalize anyone who has seen fit either to go to a foreign country or to remain in a foreign country and enjoy this pension. Since I have been a Member of Congress, which is now nearly four years, there has been a definite policy followed by this House which was expressed most tersely in the Underwood tariff bill report, where it was said:

The future growth of our great industries lies beyond the seas.

And if that is true, it is the strongest kind of an invitation to the people of this country, if they want to better their condition, to go beyond the seas, because there the future growth of our great industries is to be.

I want to call attention to Canada. Of course, that is not beyond the salted seas, although it is beyond the unsalted ones, where they have had for years the most liberal homestead laws, and where under our present tariff laws the embargo has been taken down so that they can accept the invitation of the majority of this House and go into great agricultural Canada, live there, and produce agricultural products on cheap soil, and, with the American tariff either removed or very substantially reduced, send their products back to America for sale or consumption here. And the party in power, having so placed itself on record, pointing out the advantages of removal to foreign lands, should not inflict a penalty upon any of our patriotic sons and daughters or their grandsons and granddaughters for simply following out the invitation so legislatively made. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, then, I want to say further that when we were accepting these men who died and left dependents, or those men who survived to draw pensions, we did not ask in what land they were born, or what they expected to do after the war closed. Every man who offered his services to this country in its time of need was accepted for the work that he proposed to do during the war, and after that all that we have a right to exact of them, or of those who represent them is absolute equality, and that is due from us to them.

I want to say further that we should not long hereafter refrain from recognizing the widows and the orphans of our recent Spanish-American War. I want to compliment the House—and in doing that I give due credit to the majority—for its liberal action in doing what it could at this term to recognize the just claims of the widows of the Spanish-American War. I hope that before this session closes the shackles, or obstructions, or whatever you may see fit to call them, will be removed from the other Chamber, so that legitimate legislation may be enacted; and that as a part of that legitimate, much-desired, and just legislation there will be passed by that legislative body the Spanish-American widows' pension bill, already passed by this House. This should have the favorable action of that other body and the ratification of the Executive of this Government.

Beneficiaries of the Spanish-American widows' bill will be in part the wives of the young men who left their homes for Cuba or the Philippines in a great humanitarian war. These men risked their lives to disease in foreign swamp and fen as well as before foreign guns. The toll of death was not overlight, and many a young wife was left to mourn. Many more

have been bereft of protection by death among those who were honorably discharged in health.

It is more than 15 years since many of these young men, returning with new and proper sentiments of responsibility, joined their lives and fortunes with sweethearts whose letters had cheered them in the long nights and on the weary marches in the far-off islands of the seas. Many of these young men have been called hence and left widows to battle with an unsympathetic world. This Government owes these women a duty. I hope it will be performed by this Congress. It will be an act of justice. It will be a proper recognition of the service of that superb army of laborers, clerks, students, farmers—classes all—which added such a rich contribution to our country's glory.

I desire further to say that I hope that within a few years—and the time is here now, though it seems progress has not been made in recognizing the widows of the Civil War soldiers where matrimony was contracted between them and the soldiers since 1890—legislation to take effect at a period following that date such as will be fair and liberal to the large body of persons so interested should be enacted. I would not favor classifying the recipients of that bounty so that fraud might be perpetrated upon this Government. But a bill could be passed and should be passed which would give the widows who contracted matrimony with soldiers between 1890 and 1900, and even later, the benefit of the widows' pension law, which is denied them at the present time. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the amendment to which I have mainly addressed myself has come up for consideration at various sessions of Congress. It will come up for a vote now, and I trust that the same firm, patriotic stand will be taken by the membership of this House that has been taken heretofore, and that we shall not, because of the residence of the recipients of pensions, lose sight of the patriotism which they have displayed. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOWLER). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Young].

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a bill has been introduced into the Legislature of North Dakota providing that the prescriptions of all physicians shall be written in English. I presume there was a time when such a law might have been necessary. There was a time when the standards of ethics in the medical profession were not as high as they are now. Even the younger men here can remember when the doctor handed out a prescription in a mysterious way, containing the words "hydrocarbonate" and "aqua pura," meaning sugar and water. Or perhaps the prescription included the words "magnesium sulphate," which is high brow for epsom salts.

At that time we had a great many more quacks in the medical profession than we have now. I have a profound respect and admiration for the medical profession, and would not want to be understood as criticizing them. No one, however, despises a quack more than does an honest practitioner. A quack has been defined in the Century Dictionary as follows:

One who make vain and loud protestations; one who pretends to skill or knowledge of any kind which he does not possess; an impudent and fraudulent pretender to medical skill.

To tamper with dishonestly; to use fraudulently.

Well, Mr. Chairman, there are quacks outside of the medical profession. Perhaps the best illustration is found in the people who do the grading of grain, who are responsible for the grading system of the State of Minnesota.

Ten years ago I was serving in the Legislature of North Dakota. Shortly previous to that the wheat crop across the line, in Canada, was supposed to have been very seriously damaged. A snowstorm came during the early part of September, 1903, and was supposed to have done very great damage to the quality of the wheat that was raised there, to such an extent that while the wheat was being marketed those who sold it were docked 10 cents per bushel. It was called "shock frozen." Afterwards chemists examined this grain; that is to say, after the grain had gotten out of the country, the results of the experiments became known, and it was found that this frozen wheat which they had graded as No. 3 northern made more bread, and of just as good quality, as No. 1 hard. That bulletin was sent to me by a constituent, Mr. Wylie Nielson, while the legislature was in session, and as a result I introduced a bill providing that at the agricultural college there should be chemical tests made of wheat and baking tests of flour to determine the real intrinsic value of the wheats which were grown in our State.

After much opposition the bill was finally passed. The bill, which I shall not stop to read, but insert in the RECORD, if there

is no objection, made it the duty of the agricultural college, at Fargo, to make chemical tests of wheat and baking tests of flour, and to publish in bulletins the result of the tests. A copy of the bill follows:

CHAPTER 113—LAWS OF NORTH DAKOTA—1903.
(S. B. 163—George M. Young.)

An act to provide for the making of tests of wheat and flour to determine the comparative milling values of the different grades of wheat.

Be it enacted by the Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota: It shall be the duty of the North Dakota Government Agricultural Experiment Station to conduct experiments and determine the comparative milling values of the different grades of wheat and baking tests of the flour made therefrom. A record shall be kept and published of the different grades of wheat received and by whom graded, the name of the person from whom received, with address, the nature of the soil, previous cropping, and number of years which the land has been cropped, unless it appears that the wheat tested has been received from a dealer and consists of blended or mixed wheat, in which case the record shall so state. The result of the chemical analysis of each sample shall be kept, which shall show the total weight of the sample, total weight of flour, total weight of feed, total weight recovered and per cent of flour, also data as to the moisture and proteids in the different grades of wheat, and analysis of the flour made from the different grades of wheat, and the yield and quality of bread made from the different grades of wheat. In addition to such information it shall be the duty of the said North Dakota Government Agricultural Experiment Station to obtain, tabulate, and publish such other and further information in relation to the comparative values of the different grades of wheat and flour made therefrom as shall be of value to the wheat growers of this State.

The experiments made under this law were conducted by Dr. E. F. Ladd, one of the greatest chemists in the United States; one who has been called to Washington frequently in consultation; and in Bulletin No. 14, issued in January, 1915, the results of certain investigations made last year are set forth. It will not be possible to read this report fully, or even to give all the figures contained in the tables, but I think it is well worth while to anyone who is interested either in selling wheat or in buying bread, wherever he lives in the United States, to examine these tables. Their significance can not be appreciated from a mere reading, but a study of them will show that as a matter of fact there is not any very great difference in the milling value of wheats that are graded No. 1 northern, No. 2 northern, No. 3 northern, No. 4 northern, and rejected, although, as everybody knows, these numbers make a tremendous difference when a man has any wheat to sell. And it is of interest to every man who buys bread, or buys flour, because the middleman's profit is made excessively large by reason of this supposed difference in the actual value of the grades, as shown by the Minnesota grading system, but which does not exist, as shown by these experiments with the actual wheat itself.

I will say that at the agricultural college at Fargo they have a complete flour milling plant, from which the flour is made, and a laboratory that is very complete, in which these experiments are made.

Does the producer receive a fair price for all grades of wheat, asks Dr. Ladd.

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Certainly.

Mr. PLATT. Do these experiments with regard to the bread-making value of these different wheats show the value per bushel of the different grades of wheat, or per pound, or on what are they based?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The tables are given first on the basis of bushels and then afterwards in other figures to make it easier to carry in the mind on the basis of 100 pounds.

Mr. PLATT. Does the gentleman mean to say that there is very little difference between No. 1 hard and No. 4 wheat per pound as to their value for bread making?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. That is precisely what I claim, and that is precisely what is demonstrated in this bulletin.

Mr. PLATT. Do not the poorer grades of wheat contain more weeds or something else that makes them grade low? Or what is the basis?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes; that is an element that should be considered, and it is considered in this bulletin. Dr. Ladd, in determining the value of the wheat, attempts to show how much flour it will make and shows exactly what the by-products are and what their value is in the market and what the entire value of the wheat is on account of its content of flour, bran, shorts, and even the value of the screenings.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman is quoting Prof. Ladd?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes; I am quoting Dr. E. F. Ladd. To show the basis of the calculation of Dr. Ladd, permit me to read a few lines from the report:

Results from five different grades of wheat have been studied, namely, Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4 northern and rejected grades. Ten samples of each of these have been received from the crop of 1914, except

No. 1 northern, of which only four samples were received, and our conclusions are based on the average of each of these 10 samples, which confirm the findings of previous years.

In other words, this bulletin confirms experiments made in former years by Dr. Ladd.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CLINE). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. I yield to the gentleman 10 minutes more.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Dr. Ladd continues:

A comparative study of the data presented for the several grades show that there is practically no difference in the money value for the higher as compared with the lower grades. The wheat buyer, however, will raise several objections. He will immediately call attention to the weight per bushel and the small per cent flour produced by the light-weight wheat. He might also mention the color score for the baked product. The grounds for this objection appear to be sound, and the majority of wheat buyers would make the same objections—their reasons being based upon previous experience and the requirements of grade which have been established under conditions not now existing. For this reason the rule has been generally accepted until it has become firmly established and has given us our present system for the grading of wheats.

Now, coming to his first table in which he gives certain results of the grades 1, 2, 3, and 4 northern, and rejected, which is a separate grade, I want to read a few of those results. As to the milling tests the percentage of flour in No. 1 northern is 67; No. 2, 67; No. 3, 68; No. 4, 63; and rejected, 63 per cent.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is of flour content?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes. Now, then, as to bran. In No. 1 northern, it is 16 per cent; No. 2 northern, 16½ per cent; No. 3 northern, 17½ per cent; No. 4 northern, 18 per cent. The figures are quoted in round numbers. Rejected, 18.64. In other words, the rejected produces more bran than No. 1 northern, and the same is also true of No. 4 northern and No. 3 northern.

Now, as to the contents of shorts. No. 1 northern, 15.32; No. 2 northern, 14.69; No. 3 northern, 14; No. 4 northern, 18.83; rejected, 17.34.

Now, as to water absorption. The bakers who buy flour always want a flour that will be capable of large absorption; that is one of the points that a buyer of flour to be made into bread and sold commercially always takes into account.

Absorption of No. 1 northern is 58.87; No. 2 northern, 56.31; No. 3 northern, 59.91; No. 4 northern, 59.22; rejected, 58.98.

You will see from these figures that the water absorption of No. 4 northern and rejected is greater than in the higher grades.

Now, as to the volume of the loaf. It will be seen by figures that I am going to read that the lower grades are superior in that respect: No. 1 northern, 2451; No. 2 northern, 2425; No. 3 northern, 2514; No. 4 northern, 2600; rejected, 2885.

It will be seen in the size of the loaf the so-called lower grades of wheat—and I put the accent on the word "so-called"—produce a larger loaf than the so-called higher grades.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. In these baking tests which the gentleman is giving, does not the matter of nutriment enter into it largely; is not that an essential part of the test outside of the volume of the loaf?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. That is gotten by taking into account the gluten and the proteids, and so forth. Those matters are all given consideration by Dr. Ladd.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does he find that the amount of nutriment in the low grades of wheat is perceptibly less than in the higher grades of wheat?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. No; he says not. In this bulletin the results of his experiments are not given in detail, but in a former bulletin he goes into that question very thoroughly.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to say that there is no greater mystery in the world than this mystery of bread. The Minneapolis mills take Canadian and Minnesota wheat and mix it with Kansas wheat and claim that it makes a better baking test than wheat of one variety.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Dr. Ladd would agree with them in that. This bulletin shows that by the admixture of a hard wheat with a soft wheat a better bread is produced.

Following this table further as to the color, No. 1 northern is quoted at 100; No. 2 northern, 96.04. This is as to color.

Mr. NORTON. The color of the wheat or the flour?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The color of the bread. They do not make flour from bran, and that is the only thing that a man can see with the naked eye when he looks at wheat. No. 3 northern, 94.02; No. 4 northern, 95; rejected, 94.5. There is a slight difference in these percentages, but very little, as between No. 1 northern and rejected.

But it must be borne in mind that with the bakers the lower limit of the standard as to color is 88, and all of these grades, even the rejected grades, produce flour that is considerably above 88. The rejected shows up in this test at 94.5. The bulletin gives valuable information as to the value of the mill products, giving the market quotations for bran, standard middlings, flour middlings, and screenings. Then the calculation is carried further to show the value of the wheat and mill products for the several grades. It gives the value of the flour and the bran and the shorts and the screenings, and the results of this second table, which I will put in the RECORD, show that the value per 100 pounds of No. 1 northern was \$2.28; No. 2 northern, \$2.27; No. 3 northern, \$2.34; No. 4 northern, \$2.31; rejected, \$2.31½.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes.

Mr. PLATT. It seems to me that the gentleman has proved, if he has proved anything, that it is not worth while to grade wheat at all. Does the gentleman maintain that?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be much fairer to the farmer and very much fairer to the average flour mill that buys wheat if there was no grading of the wheat at all. That is the chief cause, it seems to me, of all this manipulation by which the middleman is getting an excessive profit.

Mr. PLATT. And the gentleman actually contends that No. 1 northern is not any better wheat than rejected wheat?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I commend the gentleman to a careful study of this bulletin prepared by Dr. Ladd, who is not only a great chemist but a man of integrity and honesty.

Mr. PLATT. If that is true, then there is no reason for giving any attention to improving the quality of wheat at all.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Certainly there is.

Mr. PLATT. That can hardly be true. I think the gentleman is proving too much.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I think it is important to always raise the best quality of wheat.

Mr. PLATT. But the gentleman says there is no difference in the quality.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. If the Government grades wheat this year and next year and from year to year, the standard of value of the wheat, based upon its value for making flour and the value of its by-products, would have to be determined by the Government, and if the quality of wheat were gradually on the increase from year to year, the Government would naturally take that into account. The purpose of grading it seems to me would be to simply state what the different grades of wheat are, where there is any real difference, and it would not be to create a lot of grades to represent a lot of imaginary differences such as are now in operation in Minnesota, but just have enough grades to represent what the real differences are, so that when the flour mill buys it, or when anyone buys it, to make into flour, he will know what he is getting, and the farmer who raises it will know what he is selling.

Mr. PLATT. Is it not a fact that No. 1 hard and No. 1 northern will make more flour at a less cost than any other grade?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. That is not the fact. I commend again the gentleman to a careful study of this bulletin, which clearly demonstrates that it is not a fact.

This analysis also attempts to show what it has cost the farmers in our State for the crop of 1914, because of this manipulation, and it runs into the millions. Of course, Dr. Ladd does not attempt to show what it costs as applied to the entire wheat crop of the United States. I think this is a subject to which Congress ought to give its attention, because I think it concerns every man who has a bushel of wheat to sell and every man who buys a loaf of bread. It is not a sectional question. It is not a question that is of interest only to the people of the Northwest.

Mr. KINDEL. Have you no terminals in your State which would give you a way of controlling the wheat?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. We have no terminals in North Dakota. That is one of the difficulties with us. We can not reach the situation by legislation in North Dakota, because our wheat is naturally graded at the place where it is emptied into the boats or where it reaches the big mills where it is ground into flour.

Mr. Chairman, the reading of this bulletin stirs the blood. It makes one feel like arming himself with a gun when he heads

toward the elevator with a load of wheat. That is not the thing to do. There is no use and no justice in shooting the local wheat buyer. He is not responsible for grades fixed by the Minnesota authorities. It is the Minnesota grading system which we must fight, and that can not be done by State laws. The North Dakota Legislature can not change such grading laws, nor can the legislatures of South Dakota, Ohio, nor New York. The State legislatures are helpless to cope with this phase of the marketing problem. So it is the plain duty of Congress to enact a national grain-grading law.

Who gets the enormous toll disclosed by the figures of Dr. Ladd's bulletin? The time allotted to me will not permit me to go into that feature of this subject. The big fact which stands out is that somewhere in the middle a large slice is appropriated and that the farmers and consumers both suffer. The farmer wants what his wheat is really worth. The flour millers, taken as a whole, without stopping to consider exceptions, want the wheat as near as may be as it leaves the farm without mixing or juggling of grades. The cost of the wheat to him is passed on to the consumer. He wants honest wheat and prefers to buy it under a grade which will mean something. In a great trade, such as this is, which might be carried on honorably and profitably by the two classes mentioned, it has been a matter of great surprise that the people of and general business interests of the great terminal centers have sided with the grain quacks as against the farmers, and that too, in spite of the fact that their very existence depends upon their general trade with the same farmers and their success is measured by the success of the farmers.

John McCutcheon told a good story a couple of years ago which at least reminds one of the Minnesota grain-grading quacks. It was about a band of highwaymen who had operated so long and so successfully that they became very bold. They plundered the people right and left and when the poor victims cried out in helpless despair the robbers uttered peal after peal of mocking laughter. (Pronounced softer.) So powerful did the band become that they controlled by secret and sinister means the very Government itself, and thus enjoyed great prosperity. Some of the prosperity was distributed to quiet the people, but of course the robbers kept most of it themselves. When they pounced upon a hapless wayfarer the poor man would meekly yield because of his helplessness before such powerful enemies. He would raise his eyes in despair and sigh, "Let me have the sacks back." The sentiment of the people became very bitter, but what could they do? They could not express themselves except in helpless fury. But one fine day in June a determined farmer of stout heart walked down the highway toward the place where the robbers assembled, and when the latter perceived him they nearly split their sides laughing. They leaped upon him with loud shouts of merriment. They robbed him in broad daylight, so bold had they become. But to their surprise the victim, instead of submissively yielding as all the others had done, at once began to put up a mighty fight. He fought so vigorously that the robbers were quite taken aback. "What is this?" they gasped. "Who is this brash person who dares fight back?"

In the meantime the noise of the fight had attracted a great crowd of people who came rushing up and were muttering angry threats against them. "What do you think of this?" exclaimed the robbers, appealing to the crowd. "Here we were robbing and beating this person and he is setting up an awful roar. He's a poor loser. He's a poor sport. Why doesn't he take his medicine like a man instead of squealing? When a man gets robbed he ought to be a graceful loser and acknowledge that he has lost."

In other words, it is not good form to make an outcry when your substance is being taken.

There is a lesson, and perhaps a prophecy in this. The farmers have become aroused. They are alive to their interests, and they have stout, resolute hearts. They know that they are being victimized, and they know we can help them by national legislation. They are organizing. They mean business. But best of all the consumers of wheat products are waking up to the fact that they have been and are being held up. In the past the demand for a national grain-grading law, for that is our only relief, has been considered a sectional question, one of interest to a few grain-raising areas. That is far from true. It is of interest to every man, woman, and child in our great Nation. It concerns vitally every man who raises a bushel of wheat and every man who buys a loaf of bread. The poor factory worker who has difficulty in making his pay check cover the actual needs of his family, and the farmer, whose work is never done and whose problems are real and burdensome, excepting to the writer of poetry, have a like interest and should make common cause against State grain-inspection systems. They should work unitedly for a national grading law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. I yield the gentleman one minute.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. This question concerns too many people to be lightly brushed aside. It must be settled, and it must be settled mighty soon. The farmers want it settled. The consumers want it settled. It is to the real interest of the flour millers that it should be settled. Commercial organizations in terminal cities, if they have breadth of view, should look to the welfare of the farming constituency, from whom their merchants and bankers draw custom, and take a stand for them rather than for the swollen profits of a comparative few. The time is coming when the farmers and the country merchants will deal only with those cities which will practice the golden rule. The time is coming, and I hope it will arrive quickly, when the flour manufacturers will cry loudly for relief from the monopolists who thrive under State grain-inspection systems. Perhaps it is too much to hope that these commercial bodies and the flour millers will see their permanent advantage, as well as duty, of standing by the wheat producers and flour consumers. If they do not, then let the struggle go on, anyway. Let the mighty army of farmers on one side and the city consumers on the other fight for this legislation and give no quarter to those who stand between, such as commercial organizations, that ought to know better. That kind of fight should win. That kind of fight will win. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I ask for permission to print Dr. Ladd's bulletin in full.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The bulletin is as follows:

[North Dakota Agricultural Experiment Station, Agricultural College, N. Dak. Special bulletin, food department. Volume III. January, 1915. No. 14. E. F. Ladd, commissioner.]

IS THE PRESENT SYSTEM OF GRADING WHEAT EQUITABLE?

[By E. F. Ladd.]

NOTE.—This article contains data gathered at the "Joint cooperative work of the experiment station and the Office of Grain Standardization of the United States Department of Agriculture."

Does the producer receive a fair price for all grades of wheat? This question has been repeatedly asked, and in comparing the different types and grades of wheat coming under observation one has been forced to take note of this question in previous years, but never before has the question been so forcibly presented as with the 1914 crop.

From the data before us it seems safe to answer the question that the present system of grading wheat is unfair and that the purchaser does not get an adequate price for the so-called lower grades of wheat. If this be true, what is the reason for such a condition? Our present system of grading wheat is one of gradual evolution; one change after another has been added; and perhaps when a change was made in the classification for grading there existed sufficient reason for making such changes. When some of these changes were made the prices for mill products, feeds, etc., were relatively low as compared with what they are to-day. Other products were scarcely utilized, but to-day conditions are changed and each product has its market value, and should be considered in the adjustment of grades.

This is not wholly a new question. Other investigators have previously considered the same point. Saunders (Canadian Exp. Farm Bulletin No. 50) and Shutt state that "millers could pay relatively higher prices for the intermediate grades of wheat"; that is, the grades between No. 1 northern and the wheat that is so badly damaged as to render it fit only for feeding purposes.

Wilson (S. D. Exp. Station Bulletin No. 90) and Skinner show results with feeding experiments on hogs with wheat that weighed 44 pounds per bushel and 57 pounds per bushel. Their conclusion is that there are but 6 cents per bushel difference in feeding value between the two; that is, in favor of the heavyweight wheat.

Harcourt¹ gives as his opinion that there is very little difference in the real value of the different grades of wheat, and similar conclusions are arrived at in his studies of the comparative values of the different grades of wheat for 1903 and 1904.

If we study the data presented by other investigators who have laid no stress on this matter, we find their figures confirm the same conclusion.

Results from five different grades of wheat have been studied, namely, Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4 northern and rejected grades. Ten samples of each of these have been received from the crop of 1914, except No. 1 northern, of which only 4 samples were received, and our conclusions are based on the average of each of these 10 samples, which confirm the findings of previous years. A comparative study of the data presented for the several grades shows that there is practically no difference in the money value for the higher as compared with the lower grades. The wheat buyer, however, will raise several objections. He will immediately call attention to the weight per bushel and the small per cent flour produced by the light-weight wheat. He might also mention the color score for the baked product. The grounds for his objection appear to be sound, and the majority of wheat buyers would make the same objections—their reasons being based upon previous experience and the requirements of grade which have been established under conditions not now existing. For this reason the rule has been generally accepted until it has become firmly established, and has given us our present system for the grading of wheats.

The rules generally followed are those issued by the Minnesota grain inspection department, and being governed by these rules our classification has been made on the same basis, and if there is any criticism it is that possibly we have given the highest possible grade to each wheat. The weight per bushel as given before cleaning is the weight as shown by a standard chronometer as the wheat was received, and the weight after cleaning was taken when the wheat had been cleaned over separators and scoured twice before tempering. This latter weight would show at least 1 pound, on the average, more than if cleaned by the methods usually employed by inspection departments. If we con-

sider only the question of the low per cent of flour obtained, the objection appears quite reasonable, but this is an unfair comparison, and the value of all the mill products should be taken into consideration, as has been done in the preparation of this report.

The third objection of the wheat buyer, with regard to the color score, is not as great as would seem to be on first consideration. The color score as used here is fully up to the standard for the Minneapolis patent flour as tested in the commercial laboratories. The results from all these straight flours are well within the class of the Minneapolis standard patents in color, and when we consider all the other factors shown by the baking test, the texture, volume, etc., the bread from Nos. 3, 4, and rejected wheats are found to be superior to the bread produced from the flours of the Nos. 1 and 2 northern wheats. These facts are substantiated in the data which is presented.

With the foregoing conclusions accepted, as based on actual tests, the problem then resolves itself into one of simple mathematics. The true value of the different grades, computed according to the value of the different milling products obtained from each, will furnish the desired information.

Now let us see what the findings are for the milling and baking tests for the several grades of wheat, as shown by the average for all the samples tested, 10 in each grade, except for No. 1 northern, where only 4 samples have been received this year.

Grade of wheat.	Weight per bushel.		Milling tests.						Baking tests.		
	Before cleaning.	After cleaning.	Per cent loss in cleaning.	Per cent flour.	Per cent bran.	Per cent shorts.	Per cent loss in milling.	Water absorbed, per cent.	Volume of loaf, c. c.	Color, per cent.	Texture, per cent.
No. 1 N.....	57.75	61.12	2.51	67.33	16.30	15.32	1.05	58.87	2,451	100	93.25
No. 2 N.....	55.8	59.10	3.72	67.02	16.68	14.69	1.61	56.31	2,425	96.4	93.4
No. 3 N.....	51.85	55.95	6.14	68.15	17.62	14.10	.13	59.91	2,514	94.2	90.45
No. 4 N.....	45.65	52.55	12.21	63.22	17.98	18.83	.03	59.22	2,000	95	94.7
Rejected.....	41.95	50.85	13.96	63.68	18.64	17.34	.34	58.98	2,685	94.5	94.7

From the data in table No. 1 it will be observed that in the baking tests the texture for Nos. 1 and 2 averages below that for the other three grades, considerably below the rejected even. In color Nos. 1 and 2 northern show somewhat better than the other three, but even here the rejected comes well above the lower limits for second patents, which is placed at 88 in the commercial laboratories. In volume of loaf the three lower grades are much superior to bread produced from Nos. 1 and 2 northern, the flour from the rejected making the largest volume.

The market prices for the various mill products are taken from the Northwestern Miller of Minneapolis, under date of December 9, 1914, where we find the following quotations:

Second patent (straight) per barrel.....	\$5.45 to \$5.85
Bran, per ton.....	20.25 to 21.00
Standard middlings.....	20.50 to 21.00
Flour middlings.....	26.00 to 28.00
Red Dog.....	30.00 to 30.50
Mill screenings.....	12.00 to 14.00

The average for straight flour is, therefore, \$5.65 per barrel of 196 pounds, or 2.88 cents per pound.

Mill products, in our case, have not been divided into just the same classes as quoted above; but for convenience, and that our figures may be low rather than high, we take the following:

Flour, per barrel, \$5.65; per pound, 2.88 cents.
Bran, per ton, \$20; per pound, 1 cent.
Shorts, per ton, \$25; per pound, 1.25 cents.
Mill screenings, per ton, \$12; per pound, 0.60 cent.

Or, to state these figures in another way, the market price for 100 pounds would be as follows:

Straight flour.....	\$2.88
Bran.....	1.00
Shorts.....	1.25
Screenings.....	.60

The foregoing will, therefore, serve as a basis for our conclusions. In the same publication will be found the market quotation for eight days, the average being as follows:

	Per bushel.	Per 100 pounds.
No. 1 northern.....	\$1.17	\$1.95
No. 2 northern.....	1.143	1.905
No. 3 northern.....	1.115	1.858
No. 4 northern.....	1.073	1.789
Rejected.....	1.048	1.746

We may bring our data into a table for easier comparison, showing the value of the wheat and mill products for the several grades, as follows:

	Grades of wheat—average.				
	1 N.	2 N.	3 N.	4 N.	Rejected.
Average cost per bushel.....	\$1.170	\$1.143	\$1.115	\$1.073	\$1.048
Cost per 100 pounds wheat.....	\$1.950	\$1.905	\$1.858	\$1.789	\$1.746
Pounds of product per 100 pounds wheat:					
Flour.....	67.33	67.02	68.15	63.22	63.68
Bran.....	16.30	16.68	17.62	17.98	18.64
Shorts.....	15.32	14.69	14.10	18.83	17.34
Total recovered.....	98.95	98.39	99.87	100.03	99.66
Milling loss (pounds).....	1.05	1.61	0.13	+0.25	0.34

¹ Annual Report Ontario A. C. and Exp. Farm No. 30, 1904, and No. 31, 1905.

	Grades of wheat—average.				
	1 N.	2 N.	3 N.	4 N.	Rejected.
Amount net from 100 pounds wheat:					
Flour.....	\$1.9391	\$1.9301	\$1.9627	\$1.8207	\$1.8339
Bran.....	\$0.1630	\$0.1668	\$0.1762	\$0.1798	\$0.1804
Shorts.....	\$0.1915	\$0.1836	\$0.1762	\$0.2353	\$0.2167
Screenings.....	\$0.01506	\$0.0223	\$0.0368	\$0.0732	\$0.0837
Total value.....	\$2.3087	\$2.3028	\$2.3519	\$2.3090	\$2.3147
Loss or gain in milling.....	\$0.02475	\$0.0306	\$0.0024	+\$0.0004	\$0.0059
Net returns.....	\$2.28391	\$2.2722	\$2.3495	\$2.3094	\$2.3148

The above gives the figures for the several grades in easy form for comparison, but they may be summarized to show the amount of increase in value for each 100 pounds of wheat and the mill products therefrom, as follows:

	No. 1 northern.	No. 2 northern.	No. 3 northern.	No. 4 northern.	Rejected.
Cost per 100 pounds.....	\$1.950	\$1.905	\$1.858	\$1.789	\$1.746
Receipts.....	2.28391	2.2722	2.3495	2.3094	2.3148
Increase per 100 pounds..	.33391	.3672	.4915	.5204	.5688

It will be observed from the above that for each 100 pounds of wheat the returns above the original cost are as follows:

	Net receipts.
No. 1 northern.....	\$0.33391
No. 2 northern.....	.3672
No. 3 northern.....	.4915
No. 4 northern.....	.5204
Rejected.....	.5688

The returns, therefore, for the rejected, or for Nos. 3, 4, and rejected, are considerably better than the returns for grades Nos. 1 and 2 of hard spring wheats.

We assume that the average profit on the grades for hard spring wheat, Nos. 1 and 2 northern, is enough to cover the charges of manufacture and the profit for the manufacturer, because grade No. 2 northern is generally accepted on contract.

On the same page of the same journal is to be found the quotations of receipts by car lots at Minneapolis for the several grades of wheat for the week ending Saturday. The receipts by cars were as follows:

Grade.	Cars received.				Per cent of different grades received for week ending—			
	Dec. 5.	Nov. 28.	Dec. 6, 1913.	Dec. 7, 1912.	Dec. 5.	Nov. 28.	Dec. 6, 1913.	Dec. 7, 1912.
No. 1 northern.....	506	381	801	1,424	24.57	20.78	65.90	46.75
No. 2 northern.....	480	448	292	1,251	23.30	24.40	24.05	41.07
No. 3 northern.....	587	564	105	279	28.49	30.70	8.65	9.16
No. 4 northern.....	417	360			20.25	19.60		
Rejected.....	70	83	17	92	3.39	4.52	1.40	3.02
Total cars.....	2,060	1,836	1,215	3,046	100	100	100	100

If we assume that each car contained on an average 1,000 bushels, then the following table shows the number of bushels of wheat, price per bushel, and the amount that will be paid for the several grades for the week ending December 5, 1914.

	Number of bushels.	Price per bushel.	Amount paid.
No. 1 northern.....	506,000	\$1.17	\$592,020.00
No. 2 northern.....	480,000	1.143	548,640.00
No. 3 northern.....	587,000	1.115	654,505.00
No. 4 northern.....	417,000	1.073	447,441.00
Rejected.....	70,000	1.048	73,360.00
Total.....	2,060,000		2,315,966.00

The following table shows the amount that would have been received for the products manufactured from each of these grades of wheat, excluding the screenings, together with the profit thereon:

	Amount per bushel.	Amount received.	Per cent profit.
No. 1 northern.....	\$1.3613	\$688,817.80	16.27
No. 2 northern.....	1.3499	647,952.00	18.01
No. 3 northern.....	1.3876	814,521.20	24.44
No. 4 northern.....	1.3417	559,488.90	25.04
Rejected.....	1.3386	93,702.00	27.73
Total.....		2,804,481.90	

As showing what would be received for the same wheat, and the profit thereon, including the screenings which now have a market value, we present the following summary for the same samples:

	Amount per bushel.	Amount received.	Per cent profit.
No. 1 northern.....	\$1.3703	\$693,371.80	17.12
No. 2 northern.....	1.3633	654,384.00	19.27
No. 3 northern.....	1.4097	827,493.90	26.43
No. 4 northern.....	1.3856	577,795.20	29.13
Rejected.....	1.3789	96,523.00	31.47
Total.....		2,849,567.90	

The average profit therefore for grades Nos. 1 and 2 northern, excluding the screenings, would be 17.14 per cent. If we include the screenings, then the profit on Nos. 1 and 2 northern would be 18.19 per cent, whereas the profit on the other grades ranges from 26.43 per cent to 31.47 per cent. The loss therefore to the farmer on this basis would be, without the screenings, \$91,459.33, or, including the screenings, \$136,645.33—this on the report for a single week in one market. The range for other quotations for the several weeks is even far greater than indicated above.

In the same manner we might take the figures for each of the weeks and show the loss to the producer by the present method of grading wheat. If we assume that the crop, in round figures, would amount to \$1,500,000, and that the entire crop would grade as shown from the calculated results of the data herewith given, we should have as follows:

	Per cent.
No. 1 northern.....	24.57
No. 2 northern.....	23.30
No. 3 northern.....	28.49
No. 4 northern.....	20.25
Rejected.....	3.39

Calculating in the same manner as in the preceding tables, and we have as the value for the 1914 crop, assuming the same per cents, as follows:

	Number of bushels.	Price paid.	Amount paid.
No. 1 northern.....	20,024,550	\$1.17	\$23,428,723.50
No. 2 northern.....	18,989,500	1.143	21,704,998.50
No. 3 northern.....	23,219,350	1.115	25,908,575.25
No. 4 northern.....	16,503,750	1.073	17,708,523.75
Rejected.....	2,762,850	1.048	2,894,466.80
Total.....	81,500,000		91,735,287.80

In the same manner the amount received for the wheat without screenings and with screenings is shown as follows:

	Without screenings.	Including screenings.
No. 1 northern.....	\$27,253,412.55	\$27,439,640.86
No. 2 northern.....	25,633,926.05	25,880,385.35
No. 3 northern.....	32,219,170.06	32,732,317.69
No. 4 northern.....	22,143,081.37	22,867,326.00
Rejected.....	3,697,751.01	3,837,732.36
Total.....	110,947,341.04	112,765,262.27

The amount of profit in milling grades Nos. 1 and 2 northern was 17.18 per cent. On the basis as above given, therefore, Nos. 3, 4, and rejected wheat should have netted the producer, excluding the screenings, an additional \$3,453,477; or, including the screenings, the additional value for these lower grades above that which was received for the same would be \$5,271,398.23. If our figures are correct—and they are based on actual experiments and bear out the claims made by the other investigators already referred to—then the present system of grading wheat would appear to be antiquated; perhaps adequate for a time when mill products sold at from \$8 to \$10 per ton and the weight per bushel as now graded was first established. The advance in price of mill feed since that time has made no difference in the weight per bushel regarding grade of wheat. Consequently at the present time the method employed in grading and buying wheat does not seem to be as equitable as it was before there were any grades and wheat was just wheat, without any classification.

A large amount of additional data bearing on these questions will be found in part 3 of the twenty-third annual report of the food commissioner for 1912, page 391, tables 43 and 44, where there is shown the average grades for a period of four years.

In the milling of light-weight wheat, of course, there would, in the mills that are short on bolting surface, be reduced somewhat the capacity and a slight allowance might there be required. For the average mill, however, the difference would be very little, and, on the whole, would not amount to 1 per cent of the total cost of raw material. Even admitting that this would amount to as much as 1 per cent, we would still have a balance of \$3,000,000 in favor of the light-weight wheat, and, if we consider the screenings, of over \$5,000,000. The producer of wheat might well look to a saving of some of this enormous sum not only in the lower grades of wheat but for the screenings, and then to this would be added, were we to carefully consider the question, the cost of transportation from the farm to the terminal market; also, if the feed is to be used upon the farm, the item of freight charges back from the terminal market to the farm.

In this report our purpose has been to present the summarized data with regard to the relative value for the several grades of wheat as found in our experimental work, and to point out apparent discrepancies

in the present system of wheat grading. It should also be borne in mind that the commercial mill is able to so blend different types and grades of wheat as to get more favorable end results than could be had in the milling of individual samples of wheat—that is, a rather starchy, soft spring wheat, grading No. 1 northern, would be improved by blending No. 4 and rejected grades of high gluten and large loaf volume, and the quality of all made better thereby.

There are many other problems in connection with wheat studies that need investigation, but lack of funds has prevented our enlarging the scope of work undertaken.

Again, it would be desirable to cooperate with the small mills of North Dakota in a way that might furnish them information with regard to the better utilization of the different grades of wheat produced in the State, thus encouraging the development of the milling industry within the State.

I am indebted to Mr. Sanderson, the miller, for the data gathered and presented in the foregoing article.

VELVET CHAFF AND DURUM WHEATS.

On several occasions we have pointed out the merits of Velvet Chaff and durum wheats as grown in North Dakota. In the past there has been considerable discrimination against these wheats, at times as much as 27 cents per bushel, some of which was due to a lack of knowledge as to how to handle durum in order to secure the best results in milling the same. The fact also that durum has come to be in demand for the manufacture of macaroni and semolina products has insured a better market for the better grades of durum wheats.

It is interesting to note that under date of December 25 the Sharon Reporter quotes the local price for the several wheats on the Sharon market as follows:

No. 1 northern	\$1.12
No. 2 northern	1.09
No. 3 northern	1.06
Velvet Chaff	1.12
No. 1 macaroni (durum)	1.28

It is interesting to note that Velvet Chaff, in this quotation, stands the same as No. 1 northern and that Macaroni tops the prices.

At about the same date Minneapolis quoted the price of durum wheat for exportation at \$1.45 per bushel.

We are just beginning to realize the real value of the durum wheat, and more and more as we understand its properties or come to manufacture in this country the various high-grade macaroni products we shall find the demand for this class of wheat growing, and North Dakota should be able, from the character of its soil and climate, to produce a superior product.

Even though the local quotation is the same for Velvet Chaff as for No. 1 northern, nevertheless Velvet Chaff wheat is at times still being discriminated against at the terminals. The time will come, however, in the near future, in my judgment, when we shall realize the full value of Velvet Chaff wheat as a crop for the farmer and for flour production.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally arose; and Mr. Carr, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 17907. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Interstate Bridge & Terminal Co., of Muscatine, Iowa, to build a bridge across the Mississippi River; and

H. R. 17765. An act to regulate details of majors in the Ordnance Department.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. PAGE and Mr. LANE members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the Navy Department.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield half a minute to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH].

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on a bill that I have pending on the woman suffrage question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that there is such a large number of Democrats on the other side, nine in all, that I shall have to raise the point of no quorum. Of course, I realize that a great many of them are going out on the 4th of March in any event—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Dakota make the point of no quorum?

Mr. NORTON. No; I will not make the point at this time.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON].

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, before I begin I want to ask unanimous consent to make extensions of my remarks in the RECORD?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to use the brief time available to discuss our foreign relations, and particularly our relations with the Far East. At this juncture our foreign relations are perhaps in a more critical condition than they

have been for many decades, possibly for more than a century. The importance of those relations is not confined to Europe, the chief theater of war. The most important and critical situation of all is the one in the Far East, as it has developed in the course of this war.

Space is annihilated. The nations of the world must find a way to live together as neighbors. The immediate result of the annihilation of space in the era of militarism has been a rush to arms in five countries. Out of the great war the nations will adjust themselves and find a way by which they can live peaceably as close neighbors.

What applies to nations of the same race, as found close together in Europe, will apply to the great races of the world, and especially to the great yellow race and the great white race. These two great races must find a way by which they can live together peaceably, in harmony with each other and with the world.

China embodies the bulk of the yellow race. In fact, in the Chinese Republic now live approximately one-third of the whole human race. China is the Republic of the yellow race. America is the Republic of the white race. Those two nations have already established between themselves a condition of peculiar friendship and amity. America has interested itself in the welfare of China for various reasons. I will not go over in detail the various disinterested steps that our country has taken which have drawn close the ties that bind us to the great Chinese people. The relations of China to America and to the world are threatened by a violent change of status following the capture by Japan of the German possession or leasehold of Kiaochau and its port of Tsingtau.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBSON. Certainly.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman speaks of the annihilation of space with relation to the races. Why does not Japan as the ally of England take part with their land forces in the present European war if space has been annihilated?

Mr. HOBSON. Well, I do not think it is a question of space which keeps her from taking part, because there are troops taking part in the European war that have come from longer distances than would be required for the Japanese troops.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBSON. I yield.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. As I understand, the alliance between England and Japan is that Japan is not supposed to take any stock in the war only as an adversary of Great Britain might affect Japan in the Far East. In other words, Japanese belligerency is confined to the Occident, and Japan is under no obligation to take stock in the war in Europe.

Mr. HOBSON. Well, my understanding is that the articles of alliance which were made public prescribe military cooperation in the regions of the Far East, but I understand Japan has announced her readiness to send troops to Europe under the obligations of the treaty. Now, this change of status in China by the substitution of Japan for Germany has suddenly opened up the whole far eastern question in a form to affect the very life of the Republic of China, and involves the relations of America to China, and ultimately the relations of the white race and the yellow race.

In 1899 and in 1900 the United States entered into negotiations and exchanged notes with the various nations of the world with a view to coming to a common ground in their attitude toward China. The object was clearly stated by Secretary Hay in a communication to the Chinese Government dated July 3, 1900, as follows:

The policy of the Government of the United States is to seek a solution which may bring about permanent safety and peace to China, preserve Chinese territorial and administrative entity, protect all rights guaranteed to friendly powers by treaty and international law, and safeguard for the world the principle of equal and impartial trade with all ports of the Chinese Empire.

Our Government's efforts were crowned with peculiar success. Definite written agreements were entered into with all the great nations to maintain the open-door policy in China and to respect the integrity and sovereignty of that Empire, it being then an Empire. I will not recite the correspondence here, but for purposes of reference I will put it in my remarks as an extension. The first Government to confirm those articles was Great Britain, then France, Russia was next, and then came Japan, followed by Italy, then Germany. All agreed with our Secretary of State in his attitude and his recommendations. In the case of Japan it is a peculiarly happy note of confirmation, and substantially to this effect:

Viscount Aoki to Mr. Buck: I have the happy duty of assuring your excellency that the Imperial Government will have no hesitation to give their assent to so just and fair a proposal of the United States, provided that all the other powers concerned shall accept the same.

When all the great nations had pledged their acceptance there was established the most unanimous part of international law thus far adopted by the civilized nations of the world, the just and humane principle or doctrine known as the open-door policy in China, which in principle has the same foundation as the other great American policy, the Monroe doctrine, based on respect for the rights of weak peoples and the establishment of equal opportunity for trade.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. From what is the gentleman reading?

Mr. HOBSON. I am quoting from treaties, conventions, international acts, protocols, and so forth, between United States and other powers, volume 1, Malloy. I will put these in my remarks as an extension.

Now, in 1908 our Government exchanged an identical note with the Government of Japan making more binding the open-door policy. This note had five provisos. It was exchanged between the two on November 30, 1908.

1. It is the wish of the two Governments to encourage the free and peaceful development of their commerce on the Pacific Ocean.

2. The policy of both Governments, uninfluenced by any aggressive tendencies, is directed to the maintenance of the existing status quo in the region above mentioned and to the defense of the principle of equal opportunity for commerce and industry in China.

3. They are accordingly firmly resolved reciprocally to respect the territorial possessions belonging to each other in said region.

4. They are also determined to preserve the common interest of all powers in China by supporting by all pacific means at their disposal the independence and integrity of China and the principle of equal opportunity for commerce and industry of all nations in that Empire.

5. Should any event occur threatening the status quo as above described or the principle of equal opportunity as above defined, it remains for the two Governments to communicate with each other in order to arrive at an understanding as to what measures they may consider it useful to take.

There could be no agreement more specific, more solemn, more binding or sacred to the good faith of the two Governments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOBSON. Could I have an extension? A good deal of time has been taken by asking me questions.

Mr. BARTLETT. I have no more time to yield.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. I yield to the gentleman five minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. HOBSON. In 1858 the treaty of amity and commerce was negotiated with China, and the first article of the treaty reads as follows:

There shall be, as there have always been, peace and friendship between the United States of America and the Ta Tsing Empire, and between their people, respectively. They shall not insult or oppress each other for any trifling cause, so as to produce an estrangement between them, and if any other nation should act unjustly or oppressively the United States will exert their good offices, on being informed of the case, to bring about an amicable arrangement of the question, thus showing their friendly feelings.

The relationship of our Government to the Chinese Government as established by this article is peculiar and intimate—that of an elder brother holding himself always ready to help in time of trouble. The reliance that the Chinese Government places in us is shown in the following:

CHINESE RELIANCE ON UNITED STATES—CHINESE GOVERNMENT TO UNITED STATES MINISTER AFTER BOXER TROUBLES.

Now China, driven by the irresistible course of events, has unfortunately incurred well-nigh universal indignation. For settling the present difficulty China places special reliance in the United States. We address this message to your excellency in all sincerity and candor, with the hope that your excellency will devise measures and take the initiative in bringing about a concert of the powers for the restoration of order and peace.

It was perfectly natural for our Government, acting under this obligation and under the obligation of section 5 of the joint note with Japan cited above, to ask for a statement of intentions when the Japanese proceeded to the siege of Kiaochow. Our Government was informed, so the papers stated, that the purpose of the Japanese Government was simply to remove Germany as an element of discord from the Far East, and that the intention was to restore Kiaochow and Tsingtau to the Chinese Government.

I will not here review in detail what has happened since the fall of Tsingtau, though I will put in my remarks as an extension various newspaper chronicles. Step by step a grave crisis has been created. The Chinese Government requested the Japanese Government, when the Germans had been removed, to withdraw her troops, abolishing the war zone, since no war further existed. The Japanese Government responded by making certain demands upon the Chinese Government—21 in number. Secrecy as to their nature was insisted upon by the Japanese Government, but it soon became known that Japan had very serious designs upon the sovereignty of China. The Chinese Government was not permitted to give out officially what these demands were, but the Japanese Government pro-

ceeded to give out official information that was incomplete, that omitted the very demands that struck at the integrity and sovereignty of China as a whole, such as the demand that the Chinese Government employ Japanese advisers for conducting administrative, financial, and military affairs, and the demand that the Chinese Government employ Japanese for policing China. The Japanese information likewise omitted demands striking at the principle of the open door, such as the demand for exclusive concessions in the Yangtze Valley and the heart of China.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in order to get the truth in this matter, I introduced a resolution on the 10th day of February, in line with the treaty obligation our country owes China, as pointed out here, and carrying out the spirit of section 5 of our specific agreement with Japan to discuss such questions together. The resolution called on the State Department to supply Congress with the correspondence and the facts and the information relating to these demands that are reported to have been made on the Chinese Government.

Mr. MURDOCK. Was that resolution privileged?

Mr. HOBSON. The resolution is privileged. I requested the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House to give me a hearing and to act upon this within the seven-day limit prescribed by the rules of the House. My impression was that the chairman of that committee at first was very amiably inclined to grant my reasonable request for a hearing and to take the action within the appointed time. I am informed that afterwards he conferred with the State Department and at its instance decided to ignore the regular procedure and to deny my request for a hearing and to cover up the whole question as far as practicable.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have undertaken at various times on the floor of this House to speak about conditions in the Far East. Mr. Chairman, the hiding of the truth can serve no good purpose, particularly in a republic. The people are entitled to know the truth about this question. If the demands in question are just and do not conflict with the principle of the open-door policy and do not seriously affect the status quo, then there can be no objection to this information being made public. If my demand is unjust and would invade the rights of American citizens in violating the principle of the open door and threatening the sovereignty of China, then not only our Government but our people are entitled as a right to the truth and the whole truth. The future course of China, the future course of the world, may depend upon America's doing her full duty in this crisis. A definite expression of our position would tend to relieve the situation and might avert action by them that could only lead ultimately to war. I have therefore to-day introduced a second resolution, citing our peculiar responsibility for the existence of the open-door policy in the Far East, and stating that we would view with disfavor the overthrow by any nation of the status quo during the period of the war that is distracting so many of the nations we prevailed upon to establish the open door, and stating in simple terms our adherence to the principle of the open-door policy in the Far East and that we would view with grave concern, as an unfriendly act, any offensive movement striking at the integrity and sovereignty of China.

Further on, under the five-minute rule, I will add to my remarks.

[Mr. HOBSON's address under the five-minute rule is as follows:]

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, in order to pursue further the question of foreign relations and the crisis in the Far East.

I lived in China for about a year and a half. On an average more than 1,000 Chinese worked for me during that period. We were rebuilding Spanish gunboats sunk at Manila and brought over to China to be reconstructed. This residence in China and close contact with its people led me to gain an intimate knowledge of Chinese character. I was very deeply impressed and returned with a profound and even affectionate regard for China and things Chinese. All my observations and investigations have lead me to conclude with Secretary John Hay "that the key to the world's politics for the next five centuries is China." My colleagues can imagine the solicitude I felt in reading the following extract from an article by Count Okuma, prime minister of Japan, which forecasts the ruling of China by Japan:

We must be careful to keep this point in mind and prepare ourselves with power to meet the struggle for existence.

The people who can not meet this struggle will be crushed. Some one may say that even though a country fail, the people of the country may survive. But a race whose country has fallen, being unable to stand in the struggle for existence, is bound to be oppressed by other races and their increase stopped. If one can not earn a competence, he can not marry, and human increase will cease. In that way an unseen human slaughter is perpetuated.

Thus those who are superior will govern those who are inferior. I believe within two or three centuries the world will have a few great governing countries, and others will be governed by them, will pay homage to the mighty. In other words, about four or five great countries, each having a population of 500,000,000 and an enormous territory, will be developed, and the other countries will be attached to these great ones. For instance, England, Russia, Germany, and France may be such countries. There may be one or two other independent countries.

In that event, woe to the nations which are governed. We should from now on prepare ourselves to become a governing nation, not a nation governed.

The estimated average wage throughout the Chinese Empire is about 10 cents for a hard working man, perhaps a little less. I do not hesitate to say that if the Chinese were working in the open markets of the world, according to the world's scale, that this would increase fivefold and even tenfold. The foreign commerce of China now averages less than a dollar per capita. This would increase fivefold and tenfold, with a correspondingly tremendous increase in the purchasing capacity of that people.

Now, about one-third of the human race live in China—they have about them, where they live, the richest natural resources yet undeveloped in all the world. There is no such combination elsewhere on the face of the earth. Most of the undeveloped lands of the earth elsewhere have no industrial population ready to supply the labor for development. China has. I can not help foreseeing that the great commerce of the world, the great course of the world's civilization, is going to swing around the Pacific Ocean. As important as are the events in Europe now occurring, the great futures for our children and our children's children and the human race are to be determined around the great Pacific Ocean.

It so happens that in the fullness of time America was placed in the Far East without ever having done violence to any far-eastern country. We fell heir to the responsibilities of the Philippine Islands, and yet never committed violence against them. We have never imposed opium on China; we never seized the territory of China nor of any weak people either on the Eastern or the Western Hemisphere. We stand to-day with clean hands and pure hearts on the threshold of this vast myriad of human beings, with all their stupendous possibilities of industrial development and capacity to enrich the world's commerce beyond the dreams of men to-day. I believe in destiny, because I believe in God. America stands innately for the principle of justice to the weak and equal opportunities between all—upon these foundations must be built the future peace of the world and the cause of civilization. In the march of world events America has become responsible for these principles in Atlantic and Pacific alike, under the Monroe doctrine in America and the open door in China.

Now, affairs in the Far East have reached a crisis. If a small military nation is to change the peaceful evolution of the great Chinese Republic, without question it will affect the generations unborn of all nations. In taking the stand I do, Mr. Chairman, I know that I am promoting the real cause of enduring peace. It is fundamental to say that when a people are just, as ours are, when they are disinterested and seek no selfish advantage anywhere, they ought not to be afraid of the truth, and where treaty rights give them a standing and duty calls, they ought not to be afraid to enunciate their adherence to the principles of right and justice, of humanity and sympathy, because some military power might not like it. It would be the greatest larceny, the greatest tragedy in the life history of the human species, for any military monarchy, through the power of the sword, against the rights of all other nations, and trampling upon the rights of the weak, to usurp the sovereignty of the Chinese Republic. [Applause.]

The American Nation is in honor bound, as well as bound by the dictates of self-interest, to prevent any such world tragedy. [Applause.]

[From the Washington Post, Wednesday, Feb. 10, 1915.]

JAPAN SCHEMES TO SEIZE ALL CHINA—REPUBLIC IS TO BE TAKEN, REGARDLESS OF UNITED STATES, HOBSON SAYS—TELLS HOUSE OF INTRIGUES—WANTS CONGRESS TO GET DEMANDS ALREADY MADE OF MIKADO—SEES TIME NOW FOR ACTION—ALABAMA REPRESENTATIVE DECLARES GRADUAL SUPPRESSION OF COUNTRY, FOR WHOSE INTEGRITY THIS NATION HAS GIVEN ITS PLEDGE, IS GOING ON BEHIND SCREEN OF EUROPEAN WAR—INTRODUCES RESOLUTION CALLING ON STATE DEPARTMENT TO FURNISH SERIES OF 21 DEMANDS MADE SINCE BOMBARDMENT OF TSINGTAU—CONTENDS JAPAN IS CAPITALIZING THE REWARD FOR HER ASSISTANCE TO ALLIES—JAPAN KNOWS OF HELPLESSNESS OF NATIONS TO PREVENT SEIZURE.

The positive assertion that Japan has laid plans to take over China by force, and that this is to be done with the silent acquiescence if not the open sanction of Great Britain and with an utter disregard for the open-door policy with respect to China prevailing among the powers, was made last night by Representative RICHMOND PEARSON HOBSON, of Alabama, who recited a series of significant international events in support of his statements.

TAKING ADVANTAGE OF WAR.

Mr. Hobson declared it was his opinion that Japan, in starting upon this enterprise now, is taking advantage of the general calamity in

Europe, and that, because of the war conditions, America stands as the only obstacle in the way of the accomplishment of the plan. Japan, according to Mr. Hobson's well-known views, is not greatly concerned about American opposition, being in the position rather of inviting war with this country than of avoiding it.

FORESEES DRASTIC SOVEREIGNTY.

The sovereignty which Japan would exercise over China, the Alabama student of international affairs said, will be more drastic in character than that exercised over India by Great Britain. It would not only police the country, but it would control its development and direct its educational and social advancement, if there could be such a thing under an arrangement of this character.

Mr. Hobson talked earnestly and deliberately, making his statements with a deep conviction that he was in possession of knowledge and deductions of which the American people should be apprised for their own good and protection. Prepared or not prepared for war, it was his opinion that the United States, as the one great Nation whose hands are untied by the struggle in Europe, should not sit with hands folded and without protest while a single nation takes it upon itself to wipe out treaty obligations which are solemn pledges to keep inviolate the integrity of China.

HE INTRODUCES RESOLUTION.

During the day Mr. Hobson introduced in the House a resolution calling upon the State Department to furnish Congress with whatever information the department has in its possession, officially or unofficially, with respect to a series of demands recently made upon the Chinese Government by Japan. There are 21 of these demands, and Mr. Hobson is certain that if they are made public they will reveal the purposes of Japan.

The resolution follows:

"Whereas recent press dispatches have announced that 21 demands have been made upon the Chinese Government by a foreign Government: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives, That the Secretary of State is requested, if not incompatible with the public interests, to transmit to the House of Representatives any information in the possession of the State Department from official or unofficial sources relating to any recent demands, unusual between free Governments, that may have been made upon the Chinese Government by any other Government, and any similar information as to whether any recent demands that may have been made upon the Chinese Government by another Government, if enforced, would imperil the 'open-door' policy or the integrity and sovereignty of China."

REFERRED TO COMMITTEE.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, before which Mr. Hobson will appear as soon as possible in an effort to get a favorable report.

Reports to the State Department from Tokyo and Peking so far have been so meager that officials say they have been unable to determine the exact nature of Japan's demands.

Mr. Hobson last night declared that these demands constitute the most serious event of the entire war, so far as the United States is concerned, and that they are, in fact, of more significance than all the other happenings in Europe combined.

"I have noticed with great concern," said Mr. Hobson, "a series of press dispatches from Tokio foreshadowing a very serious change in the relations of China to America and all other countries. The first dispatch stated in effect that when the fighting around Kiauchau was all over and the Chinese Government pronounced that the war zone about Kiauchau had been abolished, the Japanese Government notified the Chinese Government that its proclamation was regarded by Japan as an unfriendly act.

APPEARED VERY SINGULAR.

"Since the fighting was over and no more war operations were being executed, it appeared on the face of it very singular that the cessation of the war zone reservation by China could possibly have given any just cause of complaint by Japan or any other country.

"The next dispatch announced briefly that the Japanese Government had entered into negotiations with the Chinese Government, with a view to determining the future relations between the two Governments, and also 'with a view to regulating the future development of China.' The latter part of this dispatch in its very vagueness was ominous, to say the least, as it is difficult to see how one Government can undertake to regulate the internal affairs of another free Government.

ACQUIESCENCE OF GREAT BRITAIN.

"The next dispatch announced that Japan had the support, or at least the acquiescence, of Great Britain, and that, by inference, no other nation of Europe would take exception.

"This clearly indicated that Japan is taking advantage of the occupation of the European nations, and is capitalizing the reward for her assistance to the allies, which later was a practical free hand in China, as far as the nations of Europe are concerned.

"The next dispatch announced that Japan had made 21 distinct, specific demands on China, the substance of which were being kept a secret. The next dispatch stated in effect that the Chinese Government, in spite of the menacing attitude of Japan, was opposing and resisting all attempts to encroach upon her sovereignty. The last dispatch announced that Japan has threatened to use armed forces unless China complies with her demands, these armed forces being already on the mainland of China ready for action.

CAN BE NO MISTAKE, HE SAYS.

"There can be no mistaking what this means. Japan is proceeding substantially to annex China and suppress that country's independence and sovereignty, and Japan is doing this at the point of the bayonet.

"This is in sinister contrast with the first announcement of Japan in undertaking the siege of Kiauchau to respect the integrity of China and restore Kiauchau to the Chinese Government.

"As I recall, our American Government made prompt inquiries of Japan as to her intentions in this matter and received the reply just referred to. The recent developments, which I have just cited, of course must command the most serious consideration not only from our own Government but from every patriotic citizen and every man who loves humanity and respects the rights of the weak against the encroachments of the unjust strong.

QUESTION "TANGIBLE AND OBVIOUS."

"The question is not academic. It is concrete, tangible, and obvious. America, with the other great nations, including Japan, has

entered into solemn agreement under the leadership of the late John Hay, then Secretary of State, to respect the integrity of China and to uphold the principle of the open-door policy in China, under which all would engage in commerce on an equal footing.

"In addition to this, America has a solemn treaty compact with China, assuring to us the privileges of 'the most-favored nation.' What would become of our rights and other interests if Japanese sovereignty were extended over the entire Chinese Nation can be readily seen from what became of our rights in southern Manchuria when Japan took over that territory in China.

SEES TREATY RIGHTS IN DANGER.

"The question is best put to America and Americans alone as to whether our treaty rights with China are to be practically destroyed by an outside power. It is a question of whether the open-door policy is to be destroyed forever, a question of whether America and the other nations are to have a fair and equal chance in the competition for commerce on the Pacific, or whether a military monarchy through the use of might and brute force shall be allowed to take advantage of the general calamity in Europe to overthrow the rights of all other nations, to destroy the latest and most wonderful Republic in the world, and change the lives and destinies of one-third, and that one-third the most peaceful third of the human race.

"The least that America can do at this juncture is without delay to find out what these specific 21 demands are and therefrom what are the real purposes of Japan.

"Not only is our Government entitled to this information, but Congress and the American people are entitled to it."

[From the Washington Post, Thursday, Feb. 11, 1915.]

JAPAN'S DEMANDS ON CHINA DRASTIC—BREAK ALLIANCE WITH ENGLAND, SAY BRITISH PAPERS—RELATIONS ARE STRAINED—SPECIAL RIGHTS CLAIMED BY TOKYO FROM ORIENTAL REPUBLIC—CURB FOREIGN CONCESSIONS—CHINA MUST EMPLOY JAPANESE IN HIGH OFFICIAL POSITIONS IN ARMY, POLICE, AND FINANCIAL DEPARTMENTS, ACCORDING TO ONE VERSION OF THE DEMANDS—CAN CALL ONLY UPON TOKYO TO PRESERVE HER INTEGRITY—BRITISH "SPHERE OF INFLUENCE" MENACED—VIOLENT ATTACKS MADE ON GREAT BRITAIN BY NIPPON PRESS—ENGLISH AID IN CAMPAIGN AGAINST TSINGTAU BITTERLY RESENTED.

PEKING, February 11.

It has been learned from high Chinese authorities that the following, although it lacks important details—for instance, the number of Japanese officials to be employed—is substantially the body of the Japanese Government's demands on China:

JAPANESE DEMANDS.

No section of China's coast or any island off the coast hereafter shall be ceded or leased to another power.

China must employ Japanese in high official positions in the army, police, and financial departments.

China may call upon Japan alone for the preservation of her integrity. No foreigners except Japanese may be employed in the arsenals.

At least half of the arms and ammunition for China hereafter must be purchased from Japan.

Japan will establish an arsenal in China.

China must grant to Japan the same privileges as other nations for the establishment of schools, churches, hospitals, and missions, and for the purchase of the lands for them.

ENTERS BRITISH SPHERE.

In the Yangtse Valley, which the British have formerly considered their sphere of influence, Japan requires joint control with the Chinese of the Hanyang iron works, the Tayeh mines, and the Ping-Hsian collieries.

China may grant no competing concessions to other foreigners.

Railway concessions are demanded from Nanchang to Chauchau, from Nanchang to Kukiang, from Nanchang to Wuchang, and from Nanchang to Hangchow.

In Fukien Province, to which the Japanese lay special claim because of its proximity to the Japanese island of Formosa, the Japanese require the exclusion of other foreigners from future railway, mining, and dock building concessions, unless by Japanese consent.

DEMAND SPECIAL RIGHT.

In the Province of Shantung, besides the transfer of all the German rights, the Japanese demand special concessions, including a railway from the present line to the coast.

In inner Mongolia the exclusion of other foreigners from future mining or railway rights, except with Japan's consent, is demanded.

In Manchuria the extension of the present railway and territorial leases to 99 years is requested.

In both Mongolia and Manchuria the demand is made for the privilege of immigration and farming, as well as trading with the population, and the rights of settlement and land ownership.

All the railways demanded must be under Japanese and not Chinese control.

SEE MENACE TO ENGLAND.

The British newspapers published in the Far East suggest that Japan by her demands is breaking the alliance with Great Britain, while Japanese newspapers criticize Great Britain, in some cases violently, accusing her of having profited by the alliance and of being selfish in Japan's natural sphere.

It is stated that the relations of the allies became strained when the Japanese entered the war and the British sent 1,500 men to participate in the siege of the German fortress of Tsingtau, which some of the Japanese publications are reported to have considered not assistance, but interference.

[From the Washington Post, Sunday, Feb. 14, 1915.]

CHINA ANSWERS JAPAN—CONTENTS OF REPLY TO TOKYO'S DEMANDS KEPT SECRET—GRAVE DANGER SEEN BY UNITED STATES—REPORTED THAT GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS BELIEVE NIPPON IS ESTABLISHING ITS RULE IN NEW TERRITORY OF YUAN SHI KAI—SENATOR HITCHCOCK DECLARES UNITED STATES SHOULD PROTEST.

PEKING, CHINA, February 13.

The Chinese Government yesterday delivered to the Japanese legation at Peking a written reply to the demands recently made by Japan on China.

The contents of the Chinese answer have not been divulged. It is the general belief in Peking, however, that the reply reiterates China's willingness to discuss only 12 of the 21 demands contained in the Japanese notes.

UNITED STATES OFFICIALS ANXIOUS.

NEW YORK, February 13.

A Washington dispatch to the American says:

"Officials at the State Department are more concerned than their official obligations will allow them to admit over the persistence of reports, even from official sources, that Japan is establishing herself dangerously and perhaps permanently in new territory in China.

"M. Reinsch, United States minister at Peking, has made several reports within the last week, dealing with the accounts of the specific demands by Japan on China.

HITCHCOCK URGES PROTEST.

"Members of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate feel that the pending questions between this country and the Governments of Great Britain and Germany are not more serious for the United States than the intentions of Japan toward China.

"Senator HITCHCOCK, of Nebraska, Democratic member of the committee, said to-day:

"It looks as if Japan has seen her opportunity and intends to take advantage of it.

"I think the United States ought to protest against any steps by Japan looking toward the acquisition of control of China, but I don't think it will accomplish anything. I would do it simply to keep the record clean.

"Secretary Bryan has said there never will be war while he is in office, which means that no matter how great the wrong he will not do anything to right it; so, under the circumstances, our protest would have little weight.

AFTER CLOSE OF THE WAR.

"What will happen at the close of the war? England, France, and Germany will be impoverished, while Russia will be in splendid condition owing to her vast resources, and Japan will be as well off as ever. Japan already practically controls the Pacific Ocean, certainly the Asiatic coast, and at the end of the war she will be firmly established on the mainland. Russia will be extended very greatly in the direction of Constantinople.

"Another prominent member of the committee, a Republican, who is regarded as one of the best statesmen in the country, admitted the gravity of the situation.

"One member of the committee said he had been told by a high Japanese official that the two possible sources of friction between the United States and Japan were the latter's aspirations in Manchuria and the treatment of Japanese in California. This was an admission that Japan has her mind on acquiring a foothold on the mainland of China."

[From the Washington Post, Monday, Feb. 15, 1915.]

JAPAN PASSES CHINA—INSISTS ON ACCEPTANCE OF TOTAL DEMANDS MADE RECENTLY—PEKING REFUSES TO YIELD—YUAN'S MINISTER AT TOKYO TOLD THAT FULL COMPLIANCE WILL BE REQUIRED—JAPANESE CONSTRUCTING BARRACKS ALONG RAILWAY LEADING FROM TSINGTAU TO CAPITAL OF SHANTUNG.

PEKING, February 14.

The Chinese minister at Tokyo to-day reported to his Government that the Japanese foreign minister, Baron Takaki Kato, had declared that Japan must insist on the acceptance of the total demands recently made in the Japanese note to China. At the Chinese foreign office, however, it was said to be the intention of the Peking Government to continue in its refusal to acquiesce in the Japanese demands.

JAPAN BUILDING BARRACKS.

WEIHSHIEN, SHANTUNG, CHINA, February 14.

Wooden barracks are being constructed by the Japanese at every railway station, except the smallest, along the line between Weihshien and Tsinan. Many of the buildings are nearing completion.

ON RAILWAY TO TSINGTAU.

Tsinan is the capital of the Chinese Province of Shantung, and is connected by rail through Weihshien with Tsingtau, the port of the Kiauchau concession recently surrendered by the Germans to the Japanese troops. The distance by rail between Tsingtau and Tsinan is approximately 225 miles.

The treaty records are as follows:

1899.

OPEN-DOOR POLICY IN CHINA.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, TRANSMITTING A REPORT FROM THE SECRETARY OF STATE, WITH COPIES OF CORRESPONDENCE WITH VARIOUS FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS CONCERNING AMERICAN COMMERCIAL RIGHTS IN CHINA.

To the House of Representatives:

In response to the resolution of the House of Representatives of March 24, 1900, reading as follows:

"Whereas the commercial community of the United States is deeply interested in ascertaining the conditions which are to govern trade in such parts of the Chinese Empire as are claimed by various foreign powers to be within their 'areas of interest'; and

"Whereas bills are now pending before both Houses of Congress for the dispatch of a mission to China to study its economic conditions: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the President of the United States be requested to transmit to the House of Representatives, if not incompatible with the public service, such correspondence as may have passed between the Department of State and various foreign Governments concerning the maintenance of the 'open-door' policy in China."

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State, with accompanying papers.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,

Washington, March 27, 1900.

The President:

The undersigned, the Secretary of State, has the honor to transmit herewith, as called for by the resolution of the House of Representatives of March 24, 1900, copies of correspondence which has passed between the Department of State and the Governments of France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, and Russia concerning American commercial rights in China.

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN HAY.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, March 26, 1900.

CORRESPONDENCE CONCERNING AMERICAN COMMERCIAL RIGHTS IN CHINA.
FRANCE.

(Mr. Hay to Mr. Vignaud.)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, September 6, 1899.

SIR: I have to inclose, for your confidential information, copies of instructions I have sent under this date to the United States ambassadors at London, Berlin, and St. Petersburg in reference to the desire of this Government that the Governments of Great Britain, Germany, and Russia make formal declaration of an "open-door" policy in the territories held by them in China.

I am, etc.,

JOHN HAY.

(Inclosures:) To London, No. 205, September 6, 1899; to Berlin, No. 927, September 6, 1899; to St. Petersburg, No. 82, September 6, 1899.

(Mr. Hay to Mr. Porter.)

[Telegram.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 21, 1899.

PORTER, Ambassador, Paris:

Informally submit to French Government form of declaration outlined in inclosures with instruction No. 664, September 6, and ask whether France will join.

HAY.

(Mr. Delcassé to Mr. Porter.)

AFFAIRES ÉTRANGÈRES.

Particulier.]

[Received at United States embassy at Paris December 16, 1899.]

MON CHER AMBASSADEUR: Je trouve votre mot en rentrant. Des déclarations que j'ai apportées à la tribune de la Chambre le 24 Novembre dernier et que j'ai eu depuis l'occasion de vous rappeler, se dégagent clairement le sentiment du Gouvernement de la République; il désire dans toute la Chine, et, sous la réserve toute naturelle que toutes les puissances intéressées affirmeront leur volonté d'agir de même, il est prêt à appliquer dans les territoires qui sont cédés à bail, un traitement égal pour les citoyens et sujets de toutes les nations, notamment en ce qui concerne les taxes douanières et de navigation ainsi que les tarifs de transport par chemins de fer.

Je vous prie, mon cher Ambassadeur, d'agréer avec la nouvelle expression de mes sentiments dévoués l'assurance de ma plus haute considération.

DELCASSÉ.

[Translation.]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

MY DEAR AMBASSADOR: I find your note awaiting me on my return. The declarations which I made in the Chamber on the 24th of November last, and which I have had occasion to recall to you since then, show clearly the sentiments of the Government of the Republic. It desires throughout the whole of China and, with the quite natural reservation that all the powers interested give an assurance of their willingness to act likewise, is ready to apply in the territories which are leased to it, equal treatment to the citizens and subjects of all nations, especially in the matters of customs duties and navigation dues, as well as transportation tariffs on railways.

I beg you, my dear ambassador, to accept, etc.,

DELCASSÉ.

GERMANY.

(Mr. Hay to Mr. White.)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, September 6, 1899.

SIR: At the time when the Government of the United States was informed by that of Germany that it had leased from His Majesty the Emperor of China the port of Kiao-chao and the adjacent territory in the Province of Shantung assurances were given to the ambassador of the United States at Berlin by the Imperial German minister for foreign affairs that the rights and privileges insured by treaties with China to citizens of the United States would not thereby suffer or be in anywise impaired within the area over which Germany had thus obtained control.

More recently, however, the British Government recognized by a formal agreement with Germany the exclusive right of the latter country to enjoy in said leased area and the contiguous "sphere of influence or interest" certain privileges, more especially those relating to railroads and mining enterprises; but, as the exact nature and extent of the rights thus recognized have not been clearly defined, it is possible that serious conflicts of interest may at any time arise, not only between British and German subjects within said area, but that the interests of our citizens may also be jeopardized thereby.

Earnestly desirous to remove any cause of irritation and to insure at the same time to the commerce of all nations in China the undoubted benefits which should accrue from a formal recognition by the various powers claiming "spheres of interest" that they shall enjoy perfect equality of treatment for their commerce and navigation within such "spheres," the Government of the United States would be pleased to see His German Majesty's Government give formal assurances and lend its cooperation in securing like assurances from the other interested powers that each within its respective sphere of whatever influence—

First. Will in no way interfere with any treaty port or any vested interest within any so-called "sphere of interest" or leased territory it may have in China.

Second. That the Chinese treaty tariff of the time being shall apply to all merchandise landed or shipped to all such ports as are within said "sphere of interest" (unless they be "free ports"), no matter to what nationality it may belong, and that duties so leviable shall be collected by the Chinese Government.

Third. That it will levy no higher harbor dues on vessels of another nationality frequenting any port in such "sphere" than shall be levied on vessels of its own nationality, and no higher railroad charges over lines built, controlled, or operated within its "sphere" on merchandise belonging to citizens or subjects of other nationalities transported through such "sphere" than shall be levied on similar merchandise belonging to its own nationals transported over equal distances.

The liberal policy pursued by his Imperial German Majesty in declaring Kiao-chao a free port and in aiding the Chinese Government in the establishment there of a customhouse are so clearly in line with

the proposition which this Government is anxious to see recognized that it entertains the strongest hope that Germany will give its acceptance and hearty support.

The recent ukase of His Majesty the Emperor of Russia declaring the port of Ta-lien-wan open during the whole of the lease under which it is held from China to the merchant ships of all nations, coupled with the categorical assurances made to this Government by His Imperial Majesty's representative at this capital at the time, and since repeated to me by the present Russian ambassador, seem to insure the support of the Emperor to the proposed measure. Our ambassador at the Court of St. Petersburg has, in consequence, been instructed to submit it to the Russian Government and to request their early consideration of it. A copy of my instruction on the subject to Mr. Tower is herewith inclosed for your confidential information.

The commercial interests of Great Britain and Japan will be so clearly served by the desired declaration of intentions, and the views of the Governments of these countries as to the desirability of the adoption of measures insuring the benefits of equality of treatment of all foreign trade throughout China are so similar to those entertained by the United States, that their acceptance of the propositions herein outlined and their cooperation in advocating their adoption by the other powers can be confidently expected. I inclose herewith copy of the instruction which I have sent to Mr. Choate on the subject.

In view of the present favorable conditions, you are instructed to submit the above considerations to His Imperial German Majesty's minister for foreign affairs, and to request his early consideration of the subject.

Copy of this instruction is sent to our ambassadors at London and at St. Petersburg for their information.

I have, etc.,

JOHN HAY.

(Inclosures:) To London, September 6, 1899, No. 205; to St. Petersburg, September 6, 1899, No. 82.

(Mr. Jackson to Mr. Hay.)

[Telegram.]

EMBASSY OF THE UNITED STATES,
Berlin, December 4, 1899.

I have just had a conversation with secretary of state for foreign affairs, who stated that the politics of Germany in the extreme Orient are de facto the politics of the open door, and Germany proposes to maintain this principle in the future. Germany does not wish the question to become the subject of controversy between the different powers engaged in China. She thinks it would be advantageous for the United States Government to confer with other European Governments having interests in China. If the other cabinets adhere to the proposal of the United States Government Germany will raise no objection, and Germany is willing to have the Government of the United States inform these other cabinets that no difficulty will come from her if the other cabinets agree.

JACKSON, Chargé.

(Count von Bülow to Mr. White.)

AUSWÄRTIGES AMT,
Berlin, den 19 Februar, 1900.

HERR BOTSCHAFTER: Eure Excellenz hatten mir mittelst eines am 24. v. M. hier übergebenen Memorandums mitgeteilt, dass die Regierung der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika von allen Mächten, an welche eine gleiche Anfrage wie in Eurer Excellenz Schreiben vom 26. September v. J., betreffend die Politik der offenen Thür in China, ergangen war, zufriedenstellende schriftliche Antworten erhalten habe. Eure Excellenz hatten unter Hinweis hierauf den Wunsch ausgedrückt, dass nunmehr auch die Kaiserliche Regierung ihre Antwort in schriftlicher Form erteilen möge.

Indem ich diesen Wunsche gern entspreche, beehre ich mich in Wiederholung bereits mündlich erteilter Aufschlüsse Folgendes zu Eurer Excellenz Kenntniss zu bringen: Wie die Regierung der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika nach Eurer Excellenz erwähntem Schreiben vom 26. September v. J. anerkannt, hat die Kaiserliche Regierung in ihrem chinesischen Besitz den Grundsatz völliger Gleichbehandlung aller Nationen in Bezug auf Handel, Schiffahrt und Verkehr von Anfang an nicht allein aufgestellt, sondern auch praktisch im weitesten Umfange durchgeführt. Die Kaiserliche Regierung hegt nicht die Absicht von diesem Grundsatz, welche jede wirtschaftliche Benachteiligung oder Zurücksetzung von Angehörigen der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika von vornherein ausschliesst, in Zukunft abzugehen, so lange sie nicht durch abweichendes Verhalten anderer Regierungen aus Reciprocitätsrücksichten hierzu genötigt werden sollte. Wenn daher die übrigen, an der wirtschaftlichen Erschliessung des chinesischen Reichs interessierten Mächte sich zur Durchführung gleicher Grundsätze bekennen wollen, so kann dies der Kaiserlichen Regierung nur erwünscht sein und sie wird in diesem Falle auf Wunsch ihrerseits gern bereit sein, sich mit den Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika und den übrigen Mächten an einer in diesem Sinne zu treffenden Vereinbarung zu betheiligen, durch welche wechselseitig die gleichen Rechte gewährt werden.

Ich benutze die Gelegenheit um Eurer Excellenz die Versicherung meiner ausgezeichnetsten Hochachtung zu erneuern.

BÜLOW.

[Translation.]

FOREIGN OFFICE,
Berlin, February 19, 1900.

MR. AMBASSADOR: Your excellency informed me, in a memorandum presented on the 24th of last month, that the Government of the United States of America had received satisfactory written replies from all the powers to which an inquiry had been addressed similar to that contained in your excellency's note of September 26 last, in regard to the policy of the open door in China. While referring to this your excellency thereupon expressed the wish that the Imperial Government would now also give its answer in writing.

Gladly complying with this wish, I have the honor to inform your excellency, repeating the statements already made verbally, as follows: As recognized by the Government of the United States of America, according to your excellency's note referred to above, the Imperial Government has from the beginning not only asserted but also practically carried out to the fullest extent in its Chinese possessions absolute equality of treatment of all nations with regard to trade, navigation, and commerce. The Imperial Government entertains no thought of departing in the future from this principle, which at once excludes any prejudicial or disadvantageous commercial treatment of the citizens of the United States of America, so long as it is not forced to do so,

on account of considerations of reciprocity, by a divergence from it by other Governments. If, therefore, the other powers interested in the industrial development of the Chinese Empire are willing to recognize the same principles, this can only be desired by the Imperial Government, which in this case, upon being requested, will gladly be ready to participate with the United States of America and the other powers in an agreement made upon these lines, by which the same rights are reciprocally secured.

I avail myself, etc.,

BELLOW.

GREAT BRITAIN.

(Mr. Choate to Lord Salisbury.)

EMBASSY OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, September 22, 1899.

MY LORD: I am instructed by the Secretary of State to present to your lordship a matter which the President regards as of great and equal importance to Great Britain and the United States—in the maintenance of trade and commerce in the East, in which the interest of the two nations differs, not in character, but in degree only—and to ask for action on the part of Her Majesty's Government which the President conceives to be in exact accord with its uniformly declared policy and traditions, and which will greatly promote the welfare of commerce. He understands it to be the settled policy and purpose of Great Britain not to use any privileges which may be granted to it in China as a means of excluding any commercial rivals, and that freedom of trade for it in that Empire means freedom of trade for all the world alike. Her Majesty's Government, while conceding by formal agreements with Germany and Russia the possession of "spheres of influence or interest" in China, in which they are to enjoy especial rights and privileges, particularly in respect to railroads and mining enterprises, has at the same time sought to maintain what is commonly called the "open-door" policy, to secure to the commerce and navigation of all nations equality of treatment within such "spheres." The maintenance of this policy is alike urgently demanded by the commercial communities of our two nations, as it is justly held by them to be the only one which will improve existing conditions, enable them to maintain their positions in the markets of China, and extend their future operations.

While the Government of the United States will in no way commit itself to any recognition of the exclusive rights of any power within or control over any portion of the Chinese Empire, under such agreements as have been recently made, it can not conceal its apprehensions that there is danger of complications arising between the treaty powers which may imperil the rights insured to the United States by its treaties with China.

It is the sincere desire of my Government that the interests of its citizens may not be prejudiced through exclusive treatment by any of the controlling powers within their respective "spheres of interests" in China, and it hopes to retain there an open market for all the world's commerce, remove dangerous sources of international irritation, and thereby hasten united action of the powers at Peking to promote administrative reforms so greatly needed for strengthening the Imperial Government and maintaining the integrity of China, in which it believes the whole Western World is alike concerned. It believes that such a result may be greatly aided and advanced by declarations by the various powers claiming "spheres of interest" in China as to their intentions in regard to the treatment of foreign trade and commerce therein, and that the present is a very favorable moment for informing Her Majesty's Government of the desire of the United States to have it make on its own part and to lend its powerful support in the effort to obtain from each of the various powers claiming "spheres of interest" in China a declaration substantially to the following effect:

(1) That it will in no wise interfere with any treaty port or any vested interest within any so-called "sphere of interest" or leased territory it may have in China.

(2) That the Chinese treaty tariff of the time being shall apply to all merchandise landed or shipped to all such ports as are within such "spheres of interest" (unless they be "free ports"), no matter to what nationality it may belong, and that duties so leviable shall be collected by the Chinese Government.

(3) That it will levy no higher harbor dues on vessels of another nationality frequenting any port in such "sphere" than shall be levied on vessels of its own nationality, and no higher railroad charges over lines built, controlled, or operated within its "sphere" on merchandise belonging to citizens or subjects of other nationalities transported through such "sphere" than shall be levied on similar merchandise belonging to its own nationals transported over equal distances.

The President has strong reason to believe that the Governments of both Russia and Germany will cooperate in such an understanding as is here proposed. The recent ukase of His Majesty the Emperor of Russia declaring the port of Ta-lien-wan open to the merchant ships of all nations during the whole term of the lease under which it is to be held by Russia removes all uncertainty as to the liberal and conciliatory policy of that power and justifies the expectation that His Majesty would accede to the similar requests of the United States now being presented to him and make the desired declaration.

The recent action of Germany in declaring the port of Kiao-chao a "free port," and the aid which its Government has given China in establishing there a Chinese customhouse, coupled with oral assurances given the United States by Germany that the interests of the United States and its citizens within its "sphere" would in no wise be affected by its occupation of this portion of the Province of Shantung, encourage the belief that little opposition is to be anticipated to the President's request for a similar declaration from that power.

It is needless also to add that Japan, the power next most largely interested in the trade of China, must be in entire sympathy with the views here expressed, and that its interests will be largely served by the proposed arrangement; and the declarations of its statesmen within the last year are so entirely in line with it that the cooperation of that power is confidently relied upon.

It is therefore with the greatest pleasure that I present this matter to your lordship's attention and urge its prompt consideration by Her Majesty's Government, believing that the action is in entire harmony with its consistent theory and purpose, and that it will greatly redound to the benefit and advantage of all commercial nations alike. The prompt and sympathetic cooperation of Her Majesty's Government with the United States in this important matter will be very potent in promoting its adoption by all the powers concerned.

I have, etc.

JOSEPH H. CHOATE.

(Lord Salisbury to Mr. Choate.)

FOREIGN OFFICE,
London, September 29, 1899.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: I have read with great interest the communication which you handed to me on the 23d instant, in which you inform me of the desire of the United States Government to obtain from the various powers claiming spheres of interest in China declarations as to their intentions in regard to the treatment of foreign trade and commerce therein.

I have the honor to inform your excellency that I will lose no time in consulting my colleagues in regard to a declaration by Her Majesty's Government and on the proposal that they should cooperate with the Government of the United States in obtaining similar declarations by the other powers concerned.

In the meantime I may assure your excellency that the policy consistently advocated by this country is one of securing equal opportunity for the subjects and citizens of all nations in regard to commercial enterprise in China, and from this policy Her Majesty's Government have no intention or desire to depart.

I have, etc.,

SALISBURY.

(Lord Salisbury to Mr. Choate.)

FOREIGN OFFICE,
London, November 30, 1899.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: With reference to my note of September 29 last I have the honor to state that I have carefully considered, in communication with my colleagues, the proposal contained in your excellency's note of September 22 that a declaration should be made by foreign powers claiming "spheres of interest" in China as to their intentions in regard to the treatment of foreign trade and interest therein.

I have much pleasure in informing your excellency that Her Majesty's Government will be prepared to make a declaration in the sense desired by your Government in regard to the leased territory of Wei-hai Wei and all territory in China which may hereafter be acquired by Great Britain by lease or otherwise, and all spheres of interest now held or that may hereafter be held by her in China, provided that a similar declaration is made by other powers concerned.

I have, etc.,

SALISBURY.

(Mr. Choate to Lord Salisbury.)

EMBASSY OF THE UNITED STATES,
London, December 6, 1899.

MY LORD: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your lordship's note of November 30, in which you inform me that, after having carefully considered in connection with your colleagues, the proposals contained in my note of September 22 last Her Majesty's Government is prepared to make a declaration in the sense desired by my Government in regard to the leased territory of Wei-hai Wei and all territory in China which may hereafter be acquired by Great Britain by lease or otherwise and all "spheres of interest" now held or which may hereafter be held by her in China, provided that a similar declaration is made by other powers.

In acknowledging your lordship's note I have also, under instructions from the Secretary of State, to express to your lordship the gratification he feels at the cordial acceptance by Her Britannic Majesty's Government of the proposals of the United States.

I have, etc.,

JOSEPH H. CHOATE.

ITALY.

(Mr. Hay to Mr. Draper.)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 17, 1899.

SIR: This Government, animated with a sincere desire to insure to the commerce and industry of the United States and of all other nations perfect equality of treatment within the limits of the Chinese Empire for their trade and navigation, especially within the so-called "spheres of influence or interest" claimed by certain European powers in China, has deemed the present an opportune moment to make representations in this direction to Germany, Great Britain, Japan, and Russia.

To attain the object it has in view and to remove possible causes of international irritation and reestablish confidence so essential to commerce, it has seemed to this Government highly desirable that the various powers claiming "spheres of interest or influence" in China should give formal assurances that—

First. They will in no way interfere with any treaty port or any vested interest within any so-called "sphere of interest" or leased territory they may have in China.

Second. The Chinese treaty tariff of the time being shall apply to all merchandise landed or shipped to all such ports as are within said "sphere of interest" (unless they be "free ports"), no matter to what nationality it may belong, and that duties so leviable shall be collected by the Chinese Government.

Third. They will levy no higher harbor dues on vessels of another nationality frequenting any port in such "sphere" than shall be levied on vessels of their own nationality, and no higher railroad charges over lines built, controlled, or operated within its "sphere" on merchandise belonging to citizens or subjects of other nationalities transported through such "sphere" than shall be levied on similar merchandise belonging to their own nationals transported over equal distances.

The policy pursued by His Imperial German Majesty in declaring Tsing-tao (Kiao-chao) a free port and in aiding the Chinese Government in establishing there a customhouse, and the ukase of His Imperial Russian Majesty of August 11 last, erecting a free port at Dalny (Ta-lien-wan) are thought to be proof that these powers are not disposed to view unfavorably the proposition to recognize that they contemplate nothing which will interfere in any way with the enjoyment by the commerce of all nations of the rights and privileges guaranteed to them by existing treaties with China.

Repeated assurances from the British Government of its fixed policy to maintain throughout China freedom of trade for the whole world insure, it is believed, the ready assent of that power to our proposals. The commercial interests of Japan will also be greatly served by the above-mentioned declaration, which harmonizes with the assurances

conveyed to this Government at various times by His Imperial Japanese Majesty's diplomatic representative at this capital.

In view of the important and growing commercial interests of Italy in eastern Asia it would seem desirable that His Majesty's Government should also be informed of the steps taken by the United States to insure freedom of trade in China, in which it would find equal advantages to those which the other nations of Europe expect.

You are therefore instructed to submit to His Majesty's minister for foreign affairs the above considerations and to invite his early attention to them, expressing, in the name of your Government, the hope that they will prove acceptable and that His Majesty's Government will lend its aid and valuable assistance in securing their acceptance by the other interested powers.

I inclose, for your personal and confidential information, copies of the instructions sent to our ambassadors at Berlin, London, St. Petersburg, and to our minister at Tokio.

I am, etc.,

JOHN HAY.

(Inclosures:) To Great Britain, to Russia, to Germany, September 6, 1899; to Japan, November 13, 1899.

(The Marquis Visconti Venosta to Mr. Draper.)

ROME, 7 Gennaio, 1900.

SIGNOR AMBASCIATORE: A complemento di ciò che mi aveva fatto l'onore di comunicarmi colla sua nota del 9 Dicembre, 1899, Vostra Eccellenza mi ha partecipato ieri la notizia datale per telegrafo dal suo Governo, che tutte le Potenze interpellate dal Gabinetto di Washington in ordine alle opportunità di adottare una linea di condotta politica la quale assicuri al commercio di tutto il mondo parità di trattamento in Cina, hanno dato risposta favorevole.

Riferendomi alle sue comunicazioni e a quanto ebbi già a dichiararle colla mia nota del 23 di detto mese di Dicembre, mi è grato di dichiararle che anche il Governo del Re aderisce di buon grado ai concetti di massima svolta nella menzionata nota del 9 Dicembre.

Prego Vostra Eccellenza di volere portare questa nostra adesione alla conoscenza del Gabinetto di Washington, e profitto dell'occasione per rinnovarle, Signor Ambasciatore, gli atti della mia più alta considerazione.

VISCONTI VENOSTA.

[Translation.]

ROME, January 7, 1900.

MR. AMBASSADOR: Supplementary to what you had already done me the honor of communicating to me in your note of December 9, 1899, your excellency informed me yesterday of the telegraphic note received from your Government that all the powers consulted by the Cabinet of Washington concerning the suitability of adopting a line of policy which would insure to the trade of the whole world equality of treatment in China have given a favorable reply.

Referring to your communications and to the statements in my note of December 23 last, I take pleasure in saying that the Government of the King adheres willingly to the proposals set forth in said note of December 9.

I beg your excellency to kindly convey the notice of our adhesion to the Cabinet of Washington, and I avail myself of the occasion to renew to you, etc.,

VISCONTI VENOSTA.

JAPAN.

(Mr. Hay to Mr. Buck.)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 13, 1899.

SIR: This Government, animated with a sincere desire to insure to the commerce and industry of the United States and of all other nations perfect equality of treatment within the limits of the Chinese Empire for their trade and navigation, especially within the so-called "spheres of influence or interest" claimed by certain European powers in China, has deemed the present an opportune moment to make representations in this direction to Germany, Great Britain, and Russia.

To obtain the object it has in view and to remove possible causes of international irritation and reestablish confidence so essential to commerce, it has seemed to this Government highly desirable that the various powers claiming "spheres of interest or influence" in China should give formal assurances that—

First. They will in no way interfere with any treaty port or any vested interest within any so-called "sphere of interest" or leased territory they may have in China.

Second. The Chinese treaty tariff of the time being shall apply to all merchandise landed or shipped to all such ports as are within said "sphere of interest" (unless they be "free ports"), no matter to what nationality it may belong, and that duties so leviable shall be collected by the Chinese Government.

Third. They will levy no higher harbor dues on vessels of another nationality frequenting any port in such "sphere" than shall be levied on vessels of their own nationality, and no higher railroad charges over lines built, controlled, or operated within such "sphere" on merchandise belonging to citizens or subjects of other nationalities transported through such "sphere" than shall be levied on similar merchandise belonging to their own nationals transported over equal distances.

The policy pursued by His Imperial German Majesty in declaring Tsingtao (Kiaochow) a free port and in aiding the Chinese Government in establishing there a customhouse, and the ukase of His Imperial Russian Majesty of August 11 last in erecting a free port at Dalny (Ta-lien-wan) are thought to be proof that these powers are not disposed to view unfavorably the proposition to recognize that they contemplate nothing which will interfere in any way with the enjoyment by the commerce of all nations of the rights and privileges guaranteed to them by existing treaties with China.

Repeated assurances from the British Government of its fixed policy to maintain throughout China freedom of trade for the whole world insure, it is believed, the ready assent of that power to our proposals. It is no less confidently believed that the commercial interests of Japan would be greatly served by the above-mentioned declaration, which harmonizes with the assurances conveyed to this Government at various times by His Imperial Japanese Majesty's diplomatic representative at this capital.

You are therefore instructed to submit to His Imperial Japanese Majesty's Government the above considerations, and to invite their early attention to them, and express the earnest hope of your Govern-

ment that they will accept them and aid in securing their acceptance by the other interested powers.

I am, etc.,

JOHN HAY.

(Viscount Aoki to Mr. Buck.)

[Translation.]

DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Tokio, the 26th day, the 12th month of the 32d year of Meiji,
(December 26, 1899.)

MR. MINISTER: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the note No. 176 of the 20th instant, in which, pursuing the instructions of the United States Government, your excellency was so good as to communicate to the Imperial Government the representations of the United States as presented in notes to Russia, Germany, and Great Britain on the subject of commercial interests of the United States in China.

I have the happy duty of assuring your excellency that the Imperial Government will have no hesitation to give their assent to so just and fair a proposal of the United States, provided that all the other powers concerned shall accept the same.

I avail myself, etc.,

VISCONTI AOKI SIUZO,
Minister for Foreign Affairs.

RUSSIA.

(Mr. Hay to Mr. Towner.)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, September 6, 1899.

SIR: In 1898, when His Imperial Majesty, through his diplomatic representative at this capital, notified this Government that Russia had leased from His Imperial Chinese Majesty the ports of Port Arthur, Ta-lien-wan, and the adjacent territory in the Liaotung Peninsula in northeastern China for a period of 25 years, your predecessor received categorical assurances from the imperial minister for foreign affairs that American interests in that part of the Chinese Empire would in no way be affected thereby, neither was it the desire of Russia to interfere with the trade of other nations, and that our citizens would continue to enjoy within said leased territory all the rights and privileges guaranteed them under existing treaties with China. Assurances of a similar purport were conveyed to me by the Emperor's ambassador at this capital; while fresh proof of this is afforded by the imperial ukase of July 30–August 11 last, creating the free port of Dalny, near Ta-lien-wan, and establishing free trade for the adjacent territory.

However gratifying and reassuring such assurances may be in regard to the territory actually occupied and administered, it can not but be admitted that a further, clearer, and more formal definition of the conditions which are henceforth to hold within the so-called Russian "sphere of interest" in China as regards the commercial rights therein of our citizens is much desired by the business world of the United States, inasmuch as such a declaration would relieve it from the apprehensions which has exercised a disturbing influence during the last four years on its operations in China.

The present moment seems particularly opportune for ascertaining whether His Imperial Russian Majesty would not be disposed to give permanent form to the assurances heretofore given to this Government on this subject.

The ukase of the Emperor of August 11 of this year, declaring the port of Ta-lien-wan open to the merchant ships of all nations during the remainder of the lease under which it is held by Russia, removes the slightest uncertainty as to the liberal and conciliatory commercial policy His Majesty proposes carrying out in northeastern China, and would seem to insure us the sympathetic and, it is hoped, favorable consideration of the propositions hereinafter specified.

The principles which this Government is particularly desirous of seeing formally declared by His Imperial Majesty and by all the great powers interested in China, and which will be eminently beneficial to the commercial interests of the whole world, are:

First. The recognition that no power will in any way interfere with any treaty port or any vested interest within any leased territory or within any so-called "sphere of interest" it may have in China.

Second. That the Chinese treaty tariff of the time being shall apply to all merchandise landed or shipped to all such ports as are within said "sphere of interest" (unless they be "free ports"), no matter to what nationality it may belong, and that duties so leviable shall be collected by the Chinese Government.

Third. That it will levy no higher harbor dues on vessels of another nationality frequenting any port in such "sphere" than shall be levied on vessels of its own nationality and no higher railroad charges over lines built, controlled, or operated within its "sphere" on merchandise belonging to citizens or subjects of other nationalities transported through such "sphere" than shall be levied on similar merchandise belonging to its own nationals transported over equal distances.

The declaration of such principles by His Imperial Majesty would not only be of great benefit to foreign commerce in China, but would powerfully tend to remove dangerous sources of irritation and possible conflict between the various powers; it would reestablish confidence and security, and would give great additional weight to the concerted representations which the treaty powers may hereafter make to His Imperial Chinese Majesty in the interest of reform in Chinese administration so essential to the consolidation and integrity of that Empire, and which, it is believed, is a fundamental principle of the policy of His Majesty in Asia.

Germany has declared the port of Kiaochow, which she holds in Shangtung under a lease from China, a free port and has aided in the establishment there of a branch of the Imperial Chinese maritime customs. The Imperial German minister for foreign affairs has also given assurances that American trade would not in any way be discriminated against or interfered with, as there is no intention to close the leased territory to foreign commerce within the area which Germany claims. These facts lead this Government to believe that the Imperial German Government will lend its cooperation and give its acceptance to the proposition above outlined, and which our ambassador at Berlin is now instructed to submit to it.

That such a declaration will be favorably considered by Great Britain and Japan, the two other powers most interested in the subject, there can be no doubt. The formal and oft-repeated declarations of the British and Japanese Governments in favor of the maintenance throughout China of freedom of trade for the whole world insure us, it is believed, the ready assent of these powers to the declaration desired.

The acceptance by His Imperial Majesty of these principles must therefore inevitably lead to their recognition by all the other powers

interested, and you are instructed to submit them to the Emperor's minister for foreign affairs and urge their immediate consideration.

A copy of this construction is sent to our ambassadors at London and Berlin for their confidential information, and copies of the instructions sent to them on this subject are inclosed herewith.

I have, etc.,

JOHN HAY.

(Inclosures:) To London, September 6, 1899, No. 205; to Berlin, September 6, 1899, No. 927.

(Count Mouravieff to Mr. Tower.)

MINISTÈRE DES AFFAIRES ÉTRANGÈRES,
PREMIER DÉPARTEMENT,
Le 18 Décembre, 1899.

MONSIEUR L'AMBAassadeUR: J'ai eu l'honneur de recevoir la note de Votre Excellence en date du 8-20 Septembre a. c. relative aux principes que le Gouvernement des États-Unis désire voir adoptés en matière économique par les Puissances ayant des intérêts en Chine.

Pour ce qui est du territoire cédé à bail par la Chine à la Russie le Gouvernement Impérial a déjà manifesté sa ferme intention de pratiquer la politique de "la porte ouverte" en érigeant Dalny (Ta-lien-wan), en port franc; et si à l'avenir ce dernier port, tout en continuant à rester franc était séparé par une ligne de douanes du reste du territoire dont il s'agit, les taxes douanières seraient prélevées dans la zone soumise au tarif, sur toutes les marchandises étrangères sans distinction de nationalité.

Quant aux ports déjà ouverts, ou qui le seraient à l'avenir, par le Gouvernement Chinois, au commerce étranger et qui se trouvent en dehors du territoire cédé à bail à la Russie, le règlement des questions relatives aux taxes douanières appartient à la Chine elle-même, et le Gouvernement Impérial n'a nullement l'intention de réclamer pour ses nationaux à cet égard des privilèges quelconques à l'exclusion des autres étrangers. Il va de soi que cette assurance du Gouvernement Impérial a pour condition qu'une déclaration semblable serait faite par les autres Puissances ayant des intérêts en Chine.

Convaincu que cette réponse est de nature à satisfaire à la demande exprimée dans la note susmentionnée, le Gouvernement Impérial se félicite d'autant plus d'avoir été au devant des vœux du Gouvernement Américain, qu'il attache le plus grand prix à tout ce qui peut entretenir et consolider les relations amicales traditionnelles existant entre les deux pays.

Veuillez agréer, Monsieur l'Ambassadeur, l'assurance de ma haute considération.

COMTE MOURAVIEFF.

[Translation.]

MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
December 18-30, 1899.

Mr. AMBASSADOR: I had the honor to receive Your Excellency's note dated the 8th-20th of September last, relating to the principles which the Government of the United States would like to see adopted in commercial matters by the powers which have interests in China.

In so far as the territory leased by China to Russia is concerned, the Imperial Government has already demonstrated its firm intention to follow the policy of "the open door" by creating Dalny (Ta-lien-wan) a free port; and if at some future time that port, although remaining free itself, should be separated by a customs limit from other portions of the territory in question, the customs duties would be levied, in the zone subject to the tariff, upon all foreign merchandise without distinction as to nationality.

As to the ports now opened or hereafter to be opened to foreign commerce by the Chinese Government, and which lie beyond the territory leased to Russia, the settlement of the question of customs duties belongs to China herself, and the Imperial Government has no intention whatever of claiming any privileges for its own subjects to the exclusion of other foreigners. It is to be understood, however, that this assurance of the Imperial Government is given upon condition that a similar declaration shall be made by other powers having interests in China.

With the conviction that this reply is such as to satisfy the inquiry made in the aforementioned note, the Imperial Government is happy to have complied with the wishes of the American Government, especially as it attaches the highest value to anything that may strengthen and consolidate the traditional relations of friendship existing between the two countries.

I beg you to accept, etc.

COUNT MOURAVIEFF.

INSTRUCTIONS SENT MUTATIS MUTANDIS TO THE UNITED STATES AMBASSADORS AT LONDON, PARIS, BERLIN, ST. PETERSBURG, AND ROME, AND TO THE UNITED STATES MINISTER AT TOKYO.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 20, 1900.

SIR: The Government having accepted the declaration suggested by the United States concerning foreign trade in China, the terms of which I transmitted to you in my instruction No. — of —, and like action having been taken by all the various powers having leased territory or so-called "spheres of interest" in the Chinese Empire, as shown by the notes which I herewith transmit to you, you will please inform the Government to which you are accredited that the condition originally attached to its acceptance—that all other powers concerned should likewise accept the proposals of the United States—having been complied with, this Government will therefore consider the assent given to it by — as final and definitive.

You will also transmit to the minister for foreign affairs copies of the present inclosures, and by the same occasion convey to him the expression of the sincere gratification which the President feels at the successful termination of these negotiations, in which he sees proof of the friendly spirit which animates the various powers interested in the untrammelled development of commerce and industry in the Chinese Empire and a source of vast benefit to the whole commercial world.

I am, etc.,

JOHN HAY.

(Inclosures:) Mr. Delcassé to Mr. Porter (received December 16, 1899), with translation; Mr. Jackson to Mr. Hay, telegram, December 4, 1899; Count von Bülow to Mr. White, February 19, 1900, with translation; Lord Salisbury to Mr. Choate, November 30, 1899; Marquis Visconti Venosta to Mr. Draper, January 7, 1900, with translation; Viscount Aoki to Mr. Buck, December 26, 1899, translation; Count Mouravieff to Mr. Tower, December 18, 1899, with translation.

NOTES EXCHANGED BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND JAPAN NOVEMBER 30, 1908, DECLARING THEIR POLICY IN THE FAR EAST.

IMPERIAL JAPANESE EMBASSY,
Washington, November 30, 1908.

SIR: The exchange of views between us which has taken place at the several interviews which I have recently had the honor of holding with you has shown that Japan and the United States holding important outlying insular possessions in the region of the Pacific Ocean, the Governments of the two countries are animated by a common aim, policy, and intention in that region.

Believing that a frank avowal of that aim, policy, and intention would not only tend to strengthen the relations of friendship and good neighborhood which have immemorially existed between Japan and the United States, but would materially contribute to the preservation of the general peace, the Imperial Government have authorized me to present to you an outline of their understanding of that common aim, policy, and intention:

1. It is the wish of the two Governments to encourage the free and peaceful development of their commerce on the Pacific Ocean.

2. The policy of both Governments, uninfluenced by any aggressive tendencies, is directed to the maintenance of the existing status quo in the region above mentioned and to the defense of the principle of equal opportunity for commerce and industry in China.

3. They are accordingly firmly resolved reciprocally to respect the territorial possessions belonging to each other in said region.

4. They are also determined to preserve the common interest of all powers in China by supporting by all pacific means at their disposal the independence and integrity of China and the principle of equal opportunity for commerce and industry of all nations in that Empire.

5. Should any event occur threatening the status quo as above described or the principle of equal opportunity as above defined, it remains for the two Governments to communicate with each other in order to arrive at an understanding as to what measures they may consider it useful to take.

If the foregoing outline accords with the view of the Government of the United States, I shall be gratified to receive your confirmation.

I take this opportunity to renew to your excellency the assurance of my highest consideration.

K. TAKAHIRA.

Hon. ELIHU ROOT,
Secretary of State.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, November 30, 1908.

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your note of to-day setting forth the result of the exchange of views between us in our recent interviews defining the understanding of the two Governments in regard to their policy in the region of the Pacific Ocean.

It is a pleasure to inform you that this expression of mutual understanding is welcome to the Government of the United States as appropriate to the happy relations of the two countries and as the occasion for a concise mutual affirmation of that accordant policy respecting the Far East which the two Governments have so frequently declared in the past.

I am happy to be able to confirm to your excellency, on behalf of the United States, the declaration of the two Governments embodied in the following words:

1. It is the wish of the two Governments to encourage the free and peaceful development of their commerce on the Pacific Ocean.

2. The policy of both Governments, uninfluenced by any aggressive tendencies, is directed to the maintenance of the existing status quo in the region above mentioned and to the defense of the principle of equal opportunity for commerce and industry in China.

3. They are accordingly firmly resolved reciprocally to respect the territorial possessions belonging to each other in said region.

4. They are also determined to preserve the common interests of all powers in China by supporting by all pacific means at their disposal the independence and integrity of China and the principle of equal opportunity for commerce and industry of all nations in that Empire.

5. Should any event occur threatening the status quo as above described or the principle of equal opportunity as above defined, it remains for the two Governments to communicate with each other in order to arrive at an understanding as to what measures they may consider it useful to take.

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurance of my highest consideration.

ELIHU ROOT.

His Excellency BARON KOGORO TAKAHIRA,
Japanese Ambassador.

The resolutions are as follows:

House resolution 728.

Whereas recent press dispatches have announced that 21 demands have been made upon the Chinese Government by a foreign Government: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of State is requested, if not incompatible with the public interests, to transmit to the House of Representatives any information in the possession of the State Department from official or unofficial sources relating to any recent demands, unusual between free Governments, that may have been made upon the Chinese Government by any other Government, and any similar information as to whether any recent demands that may have been made upon the Chinese Government by any other Government, if enforced, would imperil the "open-door" policy or the integrity and sovereignty of China.

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 425) declaring the attitude of the United States toward the open-door policy in China.

Whereas pledges to respect the integrity and sovereignty of China and to maintain in that country the principle of the "open door" were mutually pledged by the United States Government with the following Governments, to wit: With the Government of Great Britain, November 30, 1899; with the Government of France, December 16, 1899; with the Government of Russia, December 18, 1899; with the Government of Japan, December 26, 1899; with the Government of Italy, January 7, 1900; with the Government of Germany, February 19, 1900; and

Whereas the Government of the United States and the Government of Japan on November 30, 1908, renewed their mutual pledges by the exchange of identical notes pledging themselves anew to maintain the status quo, to respect the integrity and sovereignty of China, and to uphold the principle of the "open door," in specific terms, as follows:

First. It is the wish of the two Governments to encourage the free and peaceful development of their commerce on the Pacific Ocean.

Second. The policy of both Governments, uninfluenced by any aggressive tendencies, is directed to the maintenance of the existing status quo in the region above mentioned and to the defense of the principle of equal opportunity for commerce and industry in China.

Third. They are accordingly firmly resolved reciprocally to respect the territorial possessions belonging to each other in said region.

Fourth. They are also determined to preserve the common interest of all powers in China by supporting by all pacific means at their disposal the independence and integrity of China and the principle of equal opportunity for commerce and industry of all nations in that Empire.

Fifth. Should any event occur threatening the status quo, as above described, or the principle of equal opportunity, as above defined, it remains for the two Governments to communicate with each other in order to arrive at an understanding as to what measures they may consider it useful to take.

And—

Whereas the mutual pledges aforesaid are based upon the clear principles of justice and right, and their faithful observance by the high contracting parties affects vitally the material interests of American citizens and the maintenance of peace, the development of prosperity, and the progress of civilization in the vast regions of the Pacific: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the people of the United States would look with disfavor upon any effort to change the status quo in China while so many of the high contracting parties pledged to maintain that status quo are distracted by war, and that the people of the United States would view with grave concern as an unfriendly act any aggressive move on the part of a foreign Government against the integrity and sovereignty of China.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gravity of the situation and the relations between the United States and Japan and China as well as our relations at this time with the European nations at war there. It seems to me that at this time and under the existing circumstances it is absolutely necessary for this House and the people of this country to place their reliance in the President of the United States. [Applause.] He represents our country in our relations with foreign nations, and it would be a serious thing for this House or this Congress without all the information which the President possesses to endeavor to interfere. Woodrow Wilson is President of the United States, elected by the people of the United States, and he occupies a position where we must trust him in these matters, and where we must not endeavor to hamper or annoy him or interfere with him. [Applause.] I believe that he wants to preserve peace and uphold our rights and the dignity of our country. I hope that we will be able both to uphold our rights and dignity and preserve peace; but the only thing that we can do under the circumstances is to have faith in the administration. [Applause.]

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I concur in everything that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has said in reference to the matter brought out by the speech of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON]. Our international situation is a delicate one, and it should be dealt with only by those who are intimately acquainted with every detail of these affairs. The inquiry proposed in the resolution of the gentleman from Alabama was a broad one, and, in my opinion, was one that ought not to have been entered into at this time. If the gentleman's resolution was privileged, as he says it was, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs had not given him that consideration he thought he deserved, he could have brought it up at the end of seven days in this House. I do not think it is privileged. It is not drawn in such a manner as to entitle it to the privilege he claims for it. I said to the gentleman I did not think it was wise at this juncture of our international affairs, at this particularly delicate period of our history, for the Foreign Affairs Committee to take up the inquiries called for in his resolution, and therefore I declined to call the committee together in special session for the purpose of considering it. [Applause.]

I believe it is the duty of every American, those in private life as well as those in public life, to give as little cause for friction with other nations as possible. I believe the paramount duty of the hour is to preserve our friendly relations with all nations as far as that can be done with due regard to the interest of our country and our people and the maintenance of our honor as a Nation.

The administration has splendidly labored to this end. The Committee on Foreign Affairs has aided at every stage of this splendid work, and in doing so we have had to suppress a number of inopportune bills and resolutions. [Applause.]

I believe I acted wisely and in the interests of peace and harmony between this country and our far eastern friends in

reference to the gentleman's resolution. I further said to him, not that the State Department had requested me not to have a hearing upon this resolution, but that the State Department thought it was unwise to enter into the inquiries suggested in his resolution; and for that reason, and because my judgment fully accords with the opinion of the State Department, I took the responsibility of not assembling the committee.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield another minute to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for one minute more.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I simply wish to ask the gentleman if he believes that this Congress ought to know the terms—the real terms—of the 21 demands that have been made upon the Chinese Government by a foreign Government?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I do not believe that this is a time for Congress to inquire into the trouble between Japan and China, if there is trouble. I think the gentleman has an exaggerated idea of the situation existing between those countries. I have no idea that Japan desires to crush the great Republic of the East; and if she did, I have no idea that China, with her 400,000,000 of people, would sit supinely by and permit her rights to be invaded and her liberties destroyed; and I am satisfied, and I believe the people of this country are satisfied, that the American Government will never allow her rights, present or prospective, in the Orient to be invaded or interfered with by any country. The gentleman can depend upon those entrusted with our foreign affairs not only to keep us out of war, as far as that result can be accomplished with honor, but to uphold and defend our rights whenever they are endangered. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, how much time have we left on this side?

The CHAIRMAN. Three minutes.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Only three minutes? I thought I had eight minutes, according to my figures here. Is that correct, Mr. Chairman, that I have only three minutes left?

The CHAIRMAN. That is all the time the gentleman from Illinois has—three minutes.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman is a bad counter. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Yes; Mr. Chairman, I yield the time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, about two hours ago there was an exciting scene on the floor of the House. I undertook to make a reply to certain attacks made upon me as well as attacks made upon Gen. Crozier, an officer of the Army, who was not present, and who, therefore, could not speak for himself. I believe the attack upon Gen. Crozier was unfair. I believe it to have been made at a time and in a place where it should not have been made. Certain gentlemen upon the other side insisted that by reason of the fact that I was undertaking to ask for fair play in behalf of a man who is serving under a Democratic administration, that therefore I was the representative of the Steel Trust or of some other trust. I asked particularly that I be given eight minutes in which to make a statement. I have been denied those few minutes. Therefore the gag rule which applied on the other side a few moments ago applies equally to this side.

While I accept the courtesy of the gentleman [Mr. HINEBAUGH] who has just yielded to me three minutes, I yield back to him the balance of my time and thank him for what I have had. [Applause.]

Mr. HINEBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, how much time have we left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back two minutes.

Mr. HINEBAUGH. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. KENT].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. KENT] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Chairman, I realize, as everyone else realizes, the delicacy of the present situation. I know, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] knows, and has so well stated, that we must trust much to the discretion of our President and to our Diplomatic Service. I do not like the resolution of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBSON], because it looks now as if at this critical time it adds to our burdens and adds to our liability to get into trouble.

We on the Pacific coast are always face to face with the oriental question as it affects our own country, and we are willing to face it, and are going to continue to face it. But how shall we do it? We shall not face our own problems aright if at this critical period we recklessly butt into the relations of Asia. There is not the least excuse for our trying to maintain a Monroe doctrine there. The Lord knows we have enough trouble in maintaining a Monroe doctrine on this continent, and what Japan may or may not do to China or China to Japan is a matter between Japan and China. If we are injured, the time for us to assert the injury is after we are hurt. It is not the time now to assert that we have anything to do with the joint relations between Japan and China. Such an assertion is out of place and dangerous, especially so at this time.

I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California yields back one minute.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed for eight minutes.

A MEMBER. You can not do it.

Mr. MOORE. Well, I submit the request.

Mr. MURDOCK. You can run an elephant through this committee. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE. My request is, Mr. Chairman, that I be permitted to proceed for eight minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] asks unanimous consent to proceed for eight minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will withdraw that request until we read the bill under the five-minute rule. Then there will be an opportunity for him.

Mr. MOORE. I get no more assistance on one side than on the other. If I can not get time to answer a personal attack, I will ask that a quorum be present.

Mr. MANN. Well, if the gentleman wants to be nasty about that, all right.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman does not want to be "nasty." The gentleman from Illinois does not appreciate the seriousness of the attack that was made on me. I think he was not present at the time. Several gentlemen attacked me on the ground that I was a representative of the trusts, in connection with charges against an Army officer that I believe to be vicious and long since exploded.

Mr. MANN. But the gentleman from Pennsylvania understands that under the practice, where the House fixes the time for general debate, the committee has no authority to extend general debate.

Mr. MOORE. I understand that; and that is the reason why I made my personal request for unanimous consent.

Mr. MANN. You can do it when we read the bill under the five-minute rule.

Mr. MOORE. I have made the request. Since my party leader desires me to withdraw it, I withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] is recognized.

Mr. BARTLETT. Have we 40 minutes left on this side, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 37 minutes left.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, as I said the other day at the opening of this debate, this bill carries \$165,000,000 for pensions. That amount will be reduced by an amendment, to be offered when the bill is considered under the five-minute rule, by making it \$164,000,000, at the request of the Secretary of the Interior.

We had hoped that this pension-roll expense would be diminished, but it has not been so diminished. The act of 1912, known as the Sherwood Act, has, besides compelling us to pay \$15,000,000 the first year to increase the pension amount, added over \$62,000,000 during the past two years. According to a statement made by the Commissioner of Pensions in the hearing before the Committee on Appropriations, the amount by which the act of 1912 would increase it would be something over \$62,000,000.

That is the reason why we have not been able to reduce the amount. We know, Mr. Chairman, that that act is a pension-service act, not for disabilities or for wounds or diseases incurred in the service. Any man who served in the Army of the United States during the Civil War for the period of 90 days is entitled, when he arrives at a certain age, to go upon the pension roll at so much per month, and there is a large number of them on the roll for that reason now.

I undertook to investigate what the Civil War has cost us in the way of pensions. Since that war we have paid out in pensions \$4,500,000,000. In addition to that, the Government of the United States, in 1866 and at other times, has appropri-

ated \$140,481,178.86 for bounties paid to men who enlisted in that service. Various States of the Union, for the purpose of securing the enlistment of men who enlisted or were drafted, paid the sum of \$285,941,036. This amount was paid to men who enlisted in the Army, in the way of bounties.

The men who received these bounties from the States, in most instances amounting to \$1,500 each, are the men whom the legislation of this Congress has placed upon the pension roll for mere service. I have no protest to make against this Government pensioning soldiers in the United States Army who suffered wounds or disease from their service. I have great honor and respect for the real soldier upon the Union side, as I have great honor and respect and love and affection for those who served in the Confederate Army, but I have not enough respect and regard for the man who enlisted for only 90 days, who, when he enlisted, received from \$500 to \$1,500 bounty from the State where he enlisted or was drafted before he would enlist, and who now comes to Congress and secures congressional action which entails this burden of \$62,000,000 additional upon the people in less than two years.

I desire to call attention to this list containing the amounts paid by each State for these bounties.

Table exhibiting, by States, the aggregate colored and drafted troops furnished to the Union Army, 1861-1865, with bounties paid by States.

States and Territories.	Colored troops furnished, 1861-1865.	Number drafted.	Bounties paid by States.
Connecticut.....	1,764	12,031	\$6,887,554
Maine.....	104	27,324	7,837,644
Massachusetts.....	3,966	41,582	22,965,550
New Hampshire.....	125	10,806	9,636,313
Rhode Island.....	1,837	4,321	820,769
Vermont.....	120	7,743	4,528,775
New England States.....	7,916	103,807	52,676,605
New Jersey.....	1,185	32,325	23,868,967
New York.....	4,125	151,488	86,629,228
Pennsylvania.....	8,612	178,873	43,154,987
Middle States.....	13,922	362,686	153,653,182
Colorado Territory.....	95		
Dakota Territory.....			
Illinois.....	1,811	32,085	17,296,205
Indiana.....	1,537	41,158	9,182,354
Iowa.....	440	7,548	1,615,171
Kansas.....	2,080	1,420	57,407
Michigan.....	1,387	22,122	9,664,855
Minnesota.....	104	10,796	2,000,464
Nebraska Territory.....			
New Mexico Territory.....			
Ohio.....	5,092	50,400	23,557,373
Wisconsin.....	165	38,395	5,855,356
Western States and Territories.....	12,711	203,924	69,229,185
California.....			
Nevada.....			
Oregon.....			
Washington Territory.....			
Pacific States.....			
Delaware.....	954	8,635	1,136,599
District of Columbia.....	3,569	14,338	134,010
Kentucky.....	23,703	29,421	692,577
Maryland.....	8,718	29,319	6,271,992
Missouri.....	8,344	21,519	1,282,149
West Virginia.....	196	3,180	864,737
Border States.....	45,184	106,412	10,383,064
Alabama.....	4,969		
Arkansas.....	5,526		
Florida.....	1,044		
Georgia.....			
Louisiana.....	3,486		
Mississippi.....	17,869		
North Carolina.....	5,035		
South Carolina.....	5,462		
Tennessee.....	20,133		
Texas.....	47		
Virginia.....			
Southern States.....	63,571		
Indian Nation.....			
Colored troops ¹			
Grand total.....	173,079	776,829	285,941,036
At large.....	733		
Not accounted for.....	5,083		
Officers.....	7,122		
Total.....	186,017		

¹ This gives colored troops enlisted in the States in rebellion; besides this there were 92,576 colored troops included (with the white soldiers) in quotas of the several States; the third column gives the aggregate of colored, but many enlisted South were credited to Northern States.

	Gross expenditure.	Expenditure growing out of the war.
Bounty to Volunteers and Regulars on enlistment.	\$38,522,046.20	\$38,522,046.20
Bounty to Volunteers and their widows and legal heirs.	31,760,345.95	31,760,345.95
Additional bounty, act of July 28, 1866.	69,998,786.71	69,998,786.71
Collection and payment of bounty, etc., to colored soldiers, etc.	168,158.11	268,158.11

In addition to that Congress in 1866 paid back bounties and bounties amounting to \$66,000,000, which, added to the others, makes a total of \$140,481,178.86. So that the States, in order to secure these men to enlist, men who had to be drafted, paid this enormous sum of \$285,941,000; and after being drafted or after enlisting, even if they served but 90 days, they are now to receive these pensions under this law.

I do not propose to criticize that law. I endeavored to do so when it was passed. I make these statements for the purpose of calling the attention of the country to the enormous amount that the people have burdened themselves for in the past and propose to burden themselves for in the future, not to men who fought from motives of patriotism, not to men who were wounded or who contracted disease, but men who became soldiers for pay, and who have never forgotten the proposition that they had to be paid to enlist, and who are now still paid by remaining on the pension rolls.

I ask unanimous consent to insert this statement in the RECORD, and also the report of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by incorporating the matter referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The report on the pension appropriation bill is as follows:

[House Report No. 1320.]

The Committee on Appropriations, in presenting the bill making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions for the fiscal year 1916, submit the following in explanation thereof:

The estimates on which the bill is based will be found on page 473 of the Book of Estimates for 1916, and amount to \$166,100,000.

The accompanying bill appropriates \$165,100,000.

The following statement gives, by appropriate title of expenditure, the amounts appropriated for 1915, the estimates for 1916, and the amounts recommended in the accompanying bill for 1916:

Title of expenditure.	Appropriations for 1915.	Estimates for 1916.	Recommended for 1916.
Payment of pensions.....	\$169,000,000	\$166,000,000	\$165,000,000
Fees of examining surgeons.....	150,000	100,000	100,000
Total.....	169,150,000	166,100,000	165,100,000

The reduction from \$169,000,000 for 1915 to \$165,000,000 for 1916 in the appropriation for payment of pensions is in accordance with the annual estimates submitted to Congress and is approved by the Commissioner of Pensions in statements made by him to the committee.

The reduction in the amount for payment of fees of examining surgeons in pension cases is also in accordance with the estimates and the recommendation of the Commissioner of Pensions from \$150,000 for 1915 to \$100,000 for 1916. This service is largely diminished for the reason that many who are put on the pension roll now because of age and service are not required to submit to medical examination.

ECONOMIES FROM ABOLISHING PENSION AGENCIES.

The pension appropriation act for the fiscal year 1913 abolished the 18 separate agents for the payment of pensions, at \$4,000 each, and created in their place a single disbursing officer at \$4,000, through whom all payments should be made. This change in the manner of paying pensions has been in operation for two years and has resulted not only in greater facility in the handling of pension disbursements but has resulted in the gratifying reduction of \$145,000 annually in the cost of paying pensions.

ESTIMATED INCREASE IN COST OF PENSIONS DUE TO ACT OF MAY 11, 1912.
[Pension Hearings, 1916, p. 12.]

The number of pensioners on the roll under the act of May 11, 1912, the amounts paid out to such pensioners, and the average

annual value per pensioner by fiscal years, as shown in the annual reports for 1912, 1913, and 1914, are as follows:

Date.	Number of pensioners.	Amount paid.	Average annual value.
June 30, 1912.....	13,246	\$23,929.94	\$260.09
June 30, 1913.....	379,064	53,306,021.82	250.62
June 30, 1914.....	369,624	97,506,549.73	256.67

The exact additional cost to the Government for pensions, due to said act of May 11, 1912, is not obtainable, as the great body of the pensioners enrolled thereunder were gained from pensioners already on the roll under other laws, and in such cases no account of payments by differences in old and new rates is maintained, all pensions paid upon the new grant being charged to the law under which it is made, and the old rate being merged in the new from the date to which payment was last made at the old rate.

The grants under the act of May 11, 1912, have been very largely to pensioners who were on the roll under the act of February 6, 1907, as will appear by the following table, which shows the number on the roll under said latter act on the dates in the above table and gives also the amounts disbursed and the average annual values:

Date.	Number of pensioners.	Amount paid.	Average annual value.
June 30, 1912.....	233,579	\$61,346,240.53	\$176.41
June 30, 1913.....	16,241	36,376,470.43	170.08
June 30, 1914.....	7,158	2,000,203.23	174.76

The total of original allowances under the act of May 11, 1912, to claimants not on the roll under other laws for the three years noted was 1,456, and the balance was made up of transfers from the general law and the act of June 27, 1890, classes of Civil War survivors. The average annual value of these two latter classes combined for the three years was \$194.27. The average annual value of the act of February 6, 1907, class for the same period was \$173.75, and the average annual value of the three classes combined for said period was \$184.01, as against an average annual value of \$255.79 in the act of May 11, 1912, class showing an increase in annual value per pensioner in the latter class of \$71.78. In a hearing before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations on January 30, 1913, it was stated by Mr. Thompson, of this bureau, that the act of May 11, 1912, would add about \$72 per annum for each pensioner.

In view of the changes going on during the period in question in the classes named, which embrace all of the Civil War survivors on the roll, a comparison of the amounts paid out would not afford trustworthy information as to the increase in cost of pensions chargeable to the act of May 11, 1912.

The amounts paid out on account of pensions for the fiscal years 1909 to 1912, inclusive, are shown as follows:

1909.....	\$161,973,703.77
1910.....	159,974,056.08
1911.....	157,325,160.35
1912.....	152,986,433.72

The reduction in pension expenditures by years was—

1910.....	\$1,999,647.69
1911.....	2,648,895.73
1912.....	4,338,726.63

In the absence of legislative provision as made by the act of May 11, 1912, and in view of the progressive decrease in expenditure above shown, a decrease of \$6,000,000 and over for the ensuing year 1913, and of \$8,000,000 and over for the year 1914, or, say, \$15,000,000 for the two years, would appear to be a conservative estimate.

As above shown, the amount expended in 1912 was \$152,986,433.72. With decreases for the ensuing years 1913 and 1914 by \$6,500,000 and \$8,500,000, respectively, the expenditures for said years would have been:

1913.....	\$146,486,433.72
1914.....	137,986,433.72
Total.....	284,472,867.44

The actual expenditures in said years were:

1913.....	\$174,171,660.80
1914.....	172,417,546.26
Total.....	346,589,207.06

The difference of \$62,116,339.62 might thus be taken to represent the additional cost to the Government for pensions chargeable to the act of May 11, 1912, for the period from date of its approval to the close of the last fiscal year, June 30, 1914.

TOTAL EXPENDITURES FOR PENSIONS.

The following table, furnished by the Commissioner of Pensions, shows the amounts paid by the Government in pensions to soldiers, sailors, and marines, their widows, minor children, and dependent relatives, on account of military and naval service since the foundation of the Republic:

War of the Revolution (estimated).....	\$70,000,000.00
War of 1812 (service pension).....	45,950,546.86
Indian wars (service pension).....	12,801,521.01
War with Mexico (service pension).....	48,693,102.08
Civil War.....	4,457,974,496.00
War with Spain and Philippine insurrection.....	46,092,740.37
Regular Establishment.....	31,036,517.21
Unclassified.....	16,508,447.41

Total..... 4,729,957,370.94

The following table, also compiled from the annual reports of the Commissioner of Pensions, shows the number of pensioners on the roll, the annual value of pensions, the disbursements on account of pensions, the number of original applications filed, and the number of original claims allowed each fiscal year from 1879 to 1914, inclusive:

Fiscal year.	Number of pensioners on the roll.	Annual value of pensions.	Disbursements on account of pensions.	Total number of applications filed, original.	Total number of claims allowed, original.
1879.....	242,755	\$25,493,742.15	\$33,664,428.92	57,118	31,346
1880.....	250,802	25,917,906.60	56,689,229.08	141,466	19,545
1881.....	268,830	28,769,967.46	50,583,405.35	31,116	27,394
1882.....	285,697	29,341,101.62	54,313,172.05	40,939	27,664
1883.....	303,658	32,245,192.43	60,427,573.81	48,776	38,162
1884.....	322,750	34,456,600.35	57,912,387.47	41,785	34,192
1885.....	345,125	38,990,985.28	65,171,937.12	40,918	35,767
1886.....	365,783	44,708,027.44	64,091,142.90	49,895	40,857
1887.....	406,007	52,824,641.22	73,752,997.08	72,465	55,194
1888.....	452,557	56,707,220.92	78,950,501.67	75,726	60,252
1889.....	489,725	64,246,582.36	88,842,720.58	81,220	61,921
1890.....	537,944	72,052,143.49	106,094,250.39	105,044	66,637
1891.....	676,160	89,247,200.20	117,312,690.50	696,941	156,486
1892.....	876,068	116,879,867.24	139,394,147.11	246,638	224,047
1893.....	966,012	130,510,179.34	156,906,637.94	119,361	121,630
1894.....	969,544	130,120,893.00	139,966,726.17	57,141	39,085
1895.....	970,524	130,048,365.00	139,807,788.78	45,361	39,185
1896.....	970,678	129,485,587.00	138,215,174.98	42,244	40,374
1897.....	976,014	129,795,428.00	139,949,717.35	50,585	50,101
1898.....	993,714	130,968,465.00	144,651,879.80	48,732	52,648
1899.....	991,519	131,617,961.00	138,355,052.95	53,881	37,077
1900.....	993,529	131,534,544.00	138,402,130.65	51,964	40,645
1901.....	997,735	131,568,216.00	138,531,483.84	58,373	44,868
1902.....	999,446	132,152,800.00	137,504,267.99	47,965	40,173
1903.....	996,545	133,029,090.00	137,759,653.71	52,325	40,136
1904.....	994,762	134,130,203.00	141,093,571.00	55,794	44,296
1905.....	998,441	136,745,295.00	141,142,861.33	52,841	50,027
1906.....	985,971	136,237,749.00	139,000,288.25	37,212	34,974
1907.....	967,371	140,850,880.00	138,155,412.46	43,619	29,945
1908.....	951,687	159,495,701.00	153,083,086.27	46,619	37,691
1909.....	946,194	160,682,870.32	161,973,703.50	35,789	45,086
1910.....	921,083	158,332,391.82	159,974,056.08	31,777	28,027
1911.....	892,098	164,894,237.80	157,325,160.35	30,601	25,519
1912.....	860,294	151,558,141.40	152,986,105.22	27,692	22,777
1913.....	820,200	171,490,784.82	174,171,660.80	27,856	19,346
1914.....	785,239	166,449,333.26	172,417,546.26	33,869	19,287

¹ Does not include 72 pensioners, class, "Brothers, sisters, sons, and daughters" under "general law," formerly carried on the New York agency roll.

FIRST PAYMENTS.

The first payments made on new certificates each year for the past five years, with the averages, and the averages of first payments, by classes, during the past year are shown in the commissioner's report, as follows:

First payments during the last five years.

Fiscal year.	Number.	Amount.	Average.
1914.....	97,052	\$4,856,614.31	\$50.04
1913.....	433,995	18,250,225.00	42.05
1912.....	78,781	4,096,502.00	53.00
1911.....	93,632	4,842,925.00	51.72
1910.....	91,448	4,858,504.00	52.13
1909.....	124,634	6,489,416.00	52.07

Average first payments in each class.

Average value of first payments:	
In original cases.....	\$67.94
In original Regular Establishment cases.....	120.49
In original act May 11, 1912, cases.....	148.97
In original act Feb. 6, 1907, cases.....	225.67
In original general law, Civil War cases.....	90.97
In original act June 27, 1890, cases.....	188.29
In original act Apr. 19, 1908, cases.....	48.68
In original War with Spain cases.....	204.18
In increase and reissue cases.....	45.25
In original War with Mexico cases.....	149.30
In original Indian wars cases.....	143.91
In all cases.....	50.04

NAVY PENSION FUND.

Navy pension fund: Section 4755 of the Revised Statutes provides that Navy pensions shall be paid out of the "Navy pension fund," upon an appropriation by Congress, so far as the same may be sufficient.

The naval pension fund at present amounts to \$14,000,000, bearing interest at the rate of 3 per cent per annum, and is created under the provisions of sections 4751 and 4752 of the Revised Statutes.

The payments on account of Navy pensions during the fiscal year 1914 aggregated \$6,047,904.48.

Pensioners and amounts paid, arranged by States, insular possessions, Canal Zone, and foreign countries, during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914.

[Report of Commissioner of Pensions, 1914, p. 34.]

	Number.	Amount.
STATE OR TERRITORY.		
Alabama.....	3,094	\$679,689.92
Alaska.....	77	16,915.36
Arizona.....	857	188,265.76
Arkansas.....	8,436	1,853,220.48
California.....	27,742	6,094,362.56
Colorado.....	7,709	1,693,513.12
Connecticut.....	9,581	2,104,754.08
Delaware.....	2,491	547,222.88
District of Columbia.....	8,607	1,890,785.76
Florida.....	4,870	1,069,841.60
Georgia.....	2,869	630,261.92
Idaho.....	2,150	472,312.00
Illinois.....	54,078	11,880,748.84
Indiana.....	47,858	10,514,339.04
Iowa.....	26,647	5,853,812.96
Kansas.....	31,017	6,814,409.76
Kentucky.....	20,449	4,492,236.32
Louisiana.....	5,146	1,130,473.28
Maine.....	13,659	3,000,609.12
Maryland.....	11,914	2,617,267.52
Massachusetts.....	32,675	7,178,401.08
Michigan.....	32,842	7,215,087.65
Minnesota.....	12,167	2,672,846.56
Mississippi.....	3,840	843,571.20
Missouri.....	37,804	8,305,676.32
Montana.....	2,294	497,355.52
Nebraska.....	13,758	3,022,357.44
Nevada.....	382	83,917.76
New Hampshire.....	6,283	1,380,249.44
New Jersey.....	19,739	4,336,858.72
New Mexico.....	1,816	398,998.88
New York.....	65,369	14,361,155.52
North Carolina.....	3,478	764,047.04
North Dakota.....	2,807	616,641.76
Ohio.....	74,250	16,312,133.60
Oklahoma.....	10,916	2,398,026.88
Oregon.....	7,469	1,640,789.92
Pennsylvania.....	72,407	15,907,263.36
Rhode Island.....	4,293	943,086.24
South Carolina.....	1,623	356,540.64
South Dakota.....	5,164	1,134,427.52
Tennessee.....	16,239	3,567,383.52
Texas.....	8,047	1,767,764.96
Utah.....	983	215,945.44
Vermont.....	6,294	1,376,075.52
Virginia.....	8,341	1,832,350.88
Washington.....	9,522	2,091,792.96
West Virginia.....	10,170	2,234,145.60
Wisconsin.....	18,941	4,160,958.88
Wyoming.....	804	176,622.72
Total.....	779,908	171,337,455.61
Canal Zone, total.....	1	240.00
INSULAR POSSESSIONS.		
Guam.....	2	504.00
Hawaii.....	72	15,816.96
Philippines.....	58	12,741.44
Porto Rico.....	35	7,688.40
Total.....	167	36,750.80
FOREIGN COUNTRIES.		
Algeria.....	1	144.00
Argentina.....	12	2,568.00
Australia.....	98	20,802.00
Austria-Hungary.....	35	6,156.00
Azores.....	6	1,104.00
Bahamas.....	3	720.00
Barbados.....	2	288.00
Belgium.....	21	5,104.32
Bermuda.....	7	1,008.00
Bolivia.....	1	180.00
Brazil.....	6	1,404.00
British West Indies.....	8	1,998.00
Bulgaria.....	2	360.00
Canada.....	2,692	520,620.00
Cape Verde Islands.....	1	96.00
Chile.....	11	3,030.00
China.....	18	4,067.16
Colombia.....	1	144.00
Comoro Islands.....	1	120.00
Costa Rica.....	3	702.00
Cuba.....	42	9,054.00
Danish West Indies.....	1	144.00

Pensioners and amounts paid, arranged by States, etc.—Continued.

	Number.	Amount.
FOREIGN COUNTRIES—continued.		
Denmark.....	48	\$9,510.00
Dominican Republic.....	1	144.00
Dutch West Indies.....	4	744.00
England.....	464	97,998.00
Egypt.....	1	144.00
Finland.....	7	1,500.00
France.....	88	20,918.00
Germany.....	404	96,204.00
Greece.....	9	1,320.00
Guatemala.....	4	732.00
Honduras.....	6	1,512.00
Hongkong.....	4	797.88
India.....	12	1,926.00
Ireland.....	415	\$5,814.10
Isle of Man.....	1	240.00
Isle of Pines.....	8	1,764.00
Italy.....	59	15,967.44
Japan.....	34	6,732.00
Liberia.....	7	1,380.00
Luxemburg.....	3	432.00
Malta.....	2	288.00
Mexico.....	75	13,662.00
Morocco.....	1	144.00
Netherlands.....	14	2,784.00
Newfoundland.....	5	858.00
New Zealand.....	20	4,086.00
Nicaragua.....	2	324.00
Norway.....	69	12,659.94
Panama.....	3	444.00
Peru.....	10	1,800.00
Portugal.....	5	1,296.00
Russia.....	10	2,040.00
Samoa.....	1	96.00
San Salvador.....	1	216.00
Scotland.....	75	14,750.16
Seychelles Islands.....	1	144.00
Siam.....	1	180.00
Society Islands.....	1	288.00
South Africa.....	12	2,832.00
Spain.....	6	1,128.00
St. Helena.....	1	144.00
Sweden.....	75	14,618.88
Switzerland.....	69	14,202.00
Tasmania.....	1	276.00
Tonga Islands.....	1	216.00
Trinidad.....	2	372.00
Turkey in Asia.....	15	2,886.00
Turkey in Europe.....	2	330.00
Uruguay.....	3	648.00
Venezuela.....	1	144.00
Wales.....	29	5,592.00
Total.....	5,163	1,034,071.88

SUMMARY.

	Pensioners.	Payments.
Pensioners residing in States and Territories and payments to them.....	779,908	\$171,337,455.61
Pensioners residing in insular possessions and Canal Zone and payments to them.....	168	36,990.80
Pensioners residing in foreign countries and payments to them.....	5,163	1,034,071.88
Total.....	785,239	172,408,518.29
Payments by Treasury Department (Treasury settlements).....		9,027.97
Total payments on account of Army and Navy pensions, 1914.....		172,417,546.26

CIVIL WAR SURVIVORS.

[From Report of Commissioner of Pensions, 1914, p. 5.]

The following shows the loss and percentage of loss to the pension roll by death of Civil War soldier pensioners from the year 1909 to 1914, inclusive. This is the first time that the percentages have been shown. It will be seen that the percentage of loss is increasing with the advancing age of the veterans.

Losses to pension roll, 1909 to 1914.

Year.	On roll at beginning of year.	Loss by death during year.	Percentage of loss.
1909.....	620,985	32,831	5.2
1910.....	593,961	35,312	5.9
1911.....	562,615	35,243	6.2
1912.....	529,884	33,981	6.3
1913.....	497,263	36,064	7.2
1914.....	462,379	33,639	7.3

Disbursements for pensions and for maintenance of pension system, 1866 to 1914.

Fiscal year.	Paid as pensions.	Cost, maintenance, and expenses.	Total.	Number of pensioners.
1866.....	\$15,450,549.88	\$407,165.00	\$15,857,714.88	126,722
1867.....	20,784,789.69	490,977.35	21,275,767.04	155,474
1868.....	23,101,509.36	553,020.34	23,654,529.70	169,643
1869.....	28,513,247.27	564,526.81	29,077,774.08	187,963
1870.....	29,351,488.78	600,997.86	29,952,486.64	198,686
1871.....	28,518,792.62	863,079.00	29,381,871.62	207,496
1872.....	29,752,746.81	951,253.00	30,703,999.81	232,229
1873.....	26,982,063.89	1,003,200.64	27,985,264.53	238,411
1874.....	30,206,778.99	966,794.13	31,173,573.12	236,241
1875.....	29,270,404.76	982,695.35	30,253,100.11	234,821
1876.....	27,936,209.53	1,015,078.81	28,951,288.34	232,137
1877.....	28,182,821.72	1,034,459.33	29,217,281.05	232,104
1878.....	26,786,009.44	1,032,500.09	27,818,509.53	223,998
1879.....	33,664,428.92	837,734.14	34,502,163.06	242,755
1880.....	56,689,229.08	935,027.28	57,624,256.36	250,802
1881.....	50,583,405.35	1,072,059.64	51,655,464.99	268,830
1882.....	54,313,172.05	1,466,236.01	55,779,408.06	285,697
1883.....	60,427,573.81	2,591,648.29	63,019,222.10	303,658
1884.....	57,912,387.47	2,835,181.00	60,747,568.47	322,756
1885.....	65,171,937.12	3,392,576.34	68,564,513.46	345,125
1886.....	64,091,142.90	3,245,016.61	67,336,159.51	365,783
1887.....	73,752,997.08	3,753,400.91	77,506,397.99	406,007
1888.....	78,950,501.67	3,515,057.27	82,465,558.94	452,557
1889.....	88,842,720.58	3,466,968.40	92,309,688.98	489,725
1890.....	106,063,850.39	3,526,382.13	109,620,232.52	537,944
1891.....	117,312,690.50	4,700,636.44	122,013,326.94	676,160
1892.....	139,394,147.11	4,898,665.80	144,292,812.91	876,068
1893.....	156,906,637.94	4,867,734.42	161,774,372.36	966,012
1894.....	139,986,726.17	3,963,976.31	143,950,702.48	969,544
1895.....	139,812,294.30	4,338,020.21	144,150,314.51	970,524
1896.....	138,220,704.46	3,991,375.61	142,212,080.07	970,678
1897.....	139,949,717.35	3,987,783.07	143,937,500.42	976,014
1898.....	144,651,879.80	4,114,091.46	148,765,971.26	993,714
1899.....	138,355,062.95	4,147,517.73	142,502,570.68	991,519
1900.....	138,462,130.65	3,841,706.74	142,303,837.39	993,592
1901.....	138,531,483.84	3,868,795.44	142,400,279.28	997,735
1902.....	137,504,267.99	3,831,378.96	141,335,646.95	999,446
1903.....	137,759,653.71	3,993,216.79	141,752,870.50	996,545
1904.....	141,093,571.49	3,849,366.25	144,942,937.74	994,762
1905.....	141,142,861.33	3,721,832.82	144,864,694.15	998,441
1906.....	139,000,288.25	3,523,269.51	142,523,557.76	985,971
1907.....	138,155,412.46	3,809,110.44	141,964,522.90	967,371
1908.....	153,093,086.27	2,800,963.36	155,894,049.63	951,687
1909.....	161,973,703.77	2,852,583.73	164,826,287.50	946,194
1910.....	159,974,056.08	2,657,673.86	162,631,729.94	921,083
1911.....	157,325,160.35	2,517,127.06	159,842,287.41	892,098
1912.....	152,988,433.72	2,448,857.31	155,435,291.03	860,294
1913.....	174,171,680.80	2,543,246.59	176,714,927.39	820,200
1914.....	172,417,546.26	2,066,507.15	174,484,053.41	785,239
Total.....	4,633,511,926.71	127,938,472.79	4,761,450,399.50

SPECIAL ACTS.

[Report of Commissioner of Pensions, p. 43.]

Since 1861 there have been allowed by special acts of Congress 43,231 pensions and increases of pensions, of which 19,680 are now on the roll, with an annual face value of \$5,944,484. Only a part of this is properly chargeable to special acts, as most of the beneficiaries had been previously pensioned under general laws at lower rates.

From June 30, 1913, and thereafter during the Sixty-third Congress, 894 persons were included in the special acts passed at the rates specified in the summary following:

Pensions granted by special act during the Sixty-third Congress subsequent to June 30, 1913.

RATES SPECIFIED.

	Number.
\$50.....	59
\$40.....	74
\$36.....	47
\$35.....	2
\$30.....	213
\$25.....	5
\$24.....	105
\$21.....	1
\$20.....	192
\$17.....	2
\$16.....	5
\$14.....	1
\$12.....	145
\$10.....	3

Inoperatives:

\$50.....	5
\$40.....	3
\$36.....	2
\$30.....	20
\$24.....	6
\$20.....	4

Total..... 894

Of the above, 153 were granted to persons not in receipt of a pension and 741 to persons then receiving smaller pensions.

The annual value of said special-act pensions is \$269,592, and the annual increase due to the same is \$115,872.

The following statement shows the number of pensions and increases of pensions granted by special acts during each Congress since March 4, 1861:

Number of pensions granted by special acts each Congress since Mar. 4, 1861.

Thirty-seventh (1861-1863)	12
Thirty-eighth (1863-1865)	27
Thirty-ninth (1865-1867)	138
Fortieth (1867-1869)	275
Forty-first (1869-1871)	85
Forty-second (1871-1873)	167
Forty-third (1873-1875)	182
Forty-fourth (1875-1877)	98
Forty-fifth (1877-1879)	230
Forty-sixth (1879-1881)	96
Forty-seventh (1881-1883)	216
Forty-eighth (1883-1885)	598
Forty-ninth (1885-1887)	856
Fiftieth (1887-1889)	1,015
Fifty-first (1889-1891)	1,388
Fifty-second (1891-1893)	217
Fifty-third (1893-1895)	119
Fifty-fourth (1895-1897)	378
Fifty-fifth (1897-1899)	694
Fifty-sixth (1899-1901)	1,391
Fifty-seventh (1901-1903)	2,171
Fifty-eighth (1903-1905)	3,355
Fifty-ninth (1905-1907)	6,030
Sixtieth (1907-1909)	6,600
Sixty-first (1909-1911)	9,649
Sixty-second (1911-1913)	6,350
Sixty-third (1913 to June 30, 1914)	894
Total	43,231

Mr. BARTLETT. The information which I have given as to these bounties is taken from a work called "American Politics," by Mr. Cooper, a Republican, of Pennsylvania, who for a number of years was a member of the Pennsylvania Legislature and chairman of the Republican State committee in 1881-82. It is to be found on page 74 of that volume.

I get this statement with reference to the \$142,000,000 that the United States Government appropriated for bounties from a document of the Senate issued in 1879, containing a statement of the expenses of the war, and which contains the amounts of bounties paid by the United States during and immediately after the war. That document puts the total expenses of the war at \$6,189,929,908.58.

This bill carries \$164,000,000 for the next year, and we appropriated \$169,000,000 last year. There is a surplus of between seven and seven and one-half million dollars on last year's appropriation. I had hoped that we could have reduced the bill by that amount, but the Commissioner of Pensions and the subcommittee and the committee did not think proper to do so.

It seems that whenever the pension roll decreases in number and amount—and it necessarily decreases in numbers as the years go by, for 35,000 to 36,000 die and drop out every year—that new schemes are to be inaugurated and devised for continuing this enormous pension roll, larger before the present war commenced than was appropriated by the European countries for any one year. For myself I protest against this kind of legislation.

I know the bill for 1912 was passed by a Democratic House, but that does not make it one that I can favor. I repeat that the soldier who is wounded and diseased by fighting his country's battles ought to have a pension, and I would be glad to vote for it. But these bills that propose simply to give these men payment, not for wounds, not for disease, not for long service, but merely because they were on the pay roll for 90 days, does not meet with my favor. The most of them that enjoy that benefit are men who went into the Army not from patriotic motives, not to defend the flag, but because there was paid to them by the States bounties sometimes as high as \$1,500 in one case.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. Why did not the committee give the Commissioner of Pensions all he asked for?

Mr. BARTLETT. We have given him all that he asked for and more.

Mr. AUSTIN. As I read the report, it is a million dollars less.

Mr. BARTLETT. Because the commissioner reduced his estimate and then further asked us to reduce it to \$164,000,000. I have his letter here.

Mr. AUSTIN. The gentleman from Georgia complains of pensioning the soldier that had no disability. Is it not a fact that the Southern States pension soldiers who are indigent?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes; who have no property.

Mr. AUSTIN. Then why should not the Federal Government do it?

Mr. BARTLETT. Because the Federal Government does not limit it in that way.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are some other things that I desire to say, not relating to pensions. First, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] this morning, in reply to my colleague [Mr. THIBBLE], said that I did not oppose a certain bill which, as far as I can learn, no House or Senate heretofore has thought proper to report and put upon the calendar, a bill to authorize the exercise of the interstate-commerce power of regulating the hours of labor of children of various States in this Union. I did not by my vote seek to oppose such a bill. I knew it was useless. I knew the forces behind that clamor paid no more attention to the restrictions of the power of this Government in that Constitution than they did on other occasions. I knew they were endeavoring to do that which Jefferson warned the people before he died, in one of his letters written after his retirement, that the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution would be used as an elastic shield under which the Federalists would endeavor to draw all the powers of the States to the Federal Government and throttle and destroy the powers of the States.

I have lived to see in the Congresses of which I have been a Member, time and time again, when the police powers of the State were swept from it under the guise of doing some great moral thing which was solely within the power of the State to do.

Mr. Chairman, I can not better illustrate what I mean than by reading just here an editorial from a great American author, who has lived long and devoted his life to the business of editing a great newspaper—Henry Watterson, of Louisville, Ky.

When the former President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt—who had, I hope, a good purpose, I will not say for the gratification of ambition to promulgate his doctrine of new nationalism, and had gone down to defeat in 1912—had taken himself to the jungles of South America to recuperate and come back again from Elba, Mr. Watterson wrote this:

The end of the Republic is not yet. Impiety we behold on every hand; ingratitude and folly; women quarreling with nature for not making them men; men quarreling with freedom for not leveling conditions; the visionary seeking to abolish disease and sin by act of Congress, the demagogue flattering these delusions; but the hand of God is not yet ready to descend to blight the land and blast the people.

Not yet; not yet. Maybe it will be His will to lead them through kindly light from the darkness of the hour to higher and better things. Who shall say? Anyhow, He has lifted all present menace of the Deluge. Once more He has saved the people in spite of themselves. The return of the native may have ornithological, even geographical significance, but not political importance. The man on horseback can only prance in the circus ring. Caesar never again; just plain Teddy of the tiger heart and forked tongue, wanting an office and wanting it bad, like the rest of those who have been here to-day and gone to-morrow, as presently he shall be.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Georgia if he has the editorial that Mr. Watterson wrote about Bryan and the Democrats in 1896?

Mr. BARTLETT. No, I have not; I read it.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is equally good authority.

Mr. BARTLETT. And a very good editorial, too. Mr. Chairman, I hope he is right. Mr. Chairman, 20 years ago, when I entered the Halls of this House as a representative of my State, where I have served continuously since that time with almost the unanimous indorsement of my people, both at the primaries and at the election, no such bill as that could have been championed, even by a so-called Democrat from Pennsylvania. [Laughter and applause.] I have no apologies to make to him or to anybody else for our position on this sort of a bill. When the gentleman says that this bill was aimed at a few Southern States who coined the labor of children into dollars, he made a statement that was far from correct; indeed, it was reckless. [Applause.] The gentleman said that it was in order to protect us. Mr. Chairman, on one or two occasions I have had the privilege of putting into the RECORD the laws of the State of Georgia in regard to child labor. The senior Senator from Georgia, then governor of Georgia, and the junior Senator, then a Member of the House, and myself aided in passing through the Legislature of the State of Georgia a law which protected children in the factory from being improperly worked, children under 14 years of age. We need no enlightenment; we need no assertion from the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] to know that we have done such a thing as that.

If the gentleman is so interested in taking care of the lives and bodies of the children who are working under the lawful age, then he might have devoted himself in years gone by and at the present time to cleaning up his own house in Pennsylvania. If I recall correctly, an investigation had by the direction of President Roosevelt, over which George Gray, then a circuit judge of the United States, presided, developed conditions so shocking and horrible in the mines of Pennsylvania, with reference not only to the employment of children, but of men and women, that the whole country was shocked. The gentleman

would better pull the beam out of his own eye before he undertakes to criticize or interfere with the mote in his neighbor's eye.

Mr. Chairman, that is all I desire to say in respect to that. We invite the slanderers down to the State of Georgia, where I live, so that they may see for themselves the happy condition, the safe condition, the contented condition of the many people employed in the mills, the children employed in the mills under the laws of Georgia, and if that does not show up well in comparison with the State of Pennsylvania, then I shall be ashamed. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] would better, I repeat, sweep out the dirt and filth on this subject from the State of Pennsylvania and the mines and workshops there before he undertakes to come in here and in his unconstitutional way undertake to protect the children of Georgia. The gentleman spoke of those who opposed by their voices and by their votes this measure. I voted against it. There is not a man in this House on either side who did not know when the bill was called up and my name was called that I would vote against it.

It is not because I have not as much at heart the interest and protection of the children of the country as has the gentleman from Pennsylvania; not because I would not advocate and have not advocated in my own State legislature the enactment of laws to protect them from avarice of the mill owners, but because I know, when the fathers builded this Government and wrote into the Constitution the words that are written there limiting the power of the Government and reserving certain rights to the States, that they intended that no one like the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] should undertake to lay his hand on the sacred ark of the covenant and invade the liberties of the people of the States by enacting a law of that kind. I believe, as do many others, that this is a Government with limited powers, and that certain rights are reserved to the States; and if that be treason to the Democratic Party and to the country, then the gentleman may make the most of it. I have lived in that sort of belief and I have advocated in this House for 20 years that belief, and I shall go out of it maintaining that belief and my own self-respect. I shall go back to my people knowing that I have kept the faith, whether they approve or do not approve, or whether the gentleman from Pennsylvania approves or does not approve. I would rather retire to private life, as I shall do, with these convictions, and go down to my grave believing in them and believing that I stand for them, than have all of the cheap claptrap notoriety that people get from endeavoring to change the laws of the State by these unauthorized and unjustifiable methods.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. I realize the gentleman's sincerity, but does the gentleman expect the Supreme Court of the United States to hold the child-labor law unconstitutional?

Mr. BARTLETT. I expect the Supreme Court of the United States to administer the law as it has heretofore declared it, and to say that you can not exercise the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution to regulate the police laws of the States.

Mr. MURDOCK. But if the Supreme Court holds that it is constitutional, what then?

Mr. BARTLETT. Then the people will have to submit to it.

Mr. MURDOCK. And in that event we would have had hold of the right horn of the dilemma and the gentleman of the wrong horn.

Mr. BARTLETT. That does not make it right. I decide these questions of constitutionality by my own convictions and not by what the Supreme Court or somebody else may say. I am the judge, and not the Supreme Court.

I did not intend to say anything on this, Mr. Chairman. I have done so because the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] threw out such a broad challenge to those of us who spoke against it and those of us who voted against it in stating that we were endeavoring to fasten upon the country wrongs perpetrated by avaricious mill owners against the children of the country.

Another thing. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed as a Democrat to any proposition looking to the Government ownership of the public utilities of this country. No Democratic platform, no Republican platform that I have ever read, and no platform of any of the great parties that have battled for the supremacy of this great Government in the last 100 years has ever advocated it. On every stump in Georgia, from the mountain to the seaboard, from Savannah to the Chattahoochee River, every Democratic candidate and speaker have rung out the protest of the Democratic fathers against so-called Government ownership or any species of Government control. That was a policy which originated as far back as 1872 with the Socialist Labor

Party. I did not believe in it then and I do not believe in it now. Men may come and men may go, parties may change and men in parties may change, but that faith I shall hold to as an abiding truth. I have kept it and I propose to keep it on all occasions, however much I may regret that the occasion arises when I shall have to assume that position and give expression to my opinion in opposition to my party. I see no difference between Government ownership of railroads and Government ownership of ships that ply the seas. In truth, I would rather under the operation of government vote for Government ownership of railroads than I would for Government ownership of ships, because the United States Government has the right to exercise the power of eminent domain through the States, also to condemn a right of way for its highways to carry the mails or military supplies, or build railroads under the commerce clause of the Constitution, as the Supreme Court has said, but whoever, until this month or this year, ever proclaimed the doctrine that the United States Government had the right to condemn a highway across God's highway, upon the seas of the world, which is God's highway, 3 miles from shore.

No man is prohibited from going upon it or sailing upon it, and you can not exercise a power or sovereignty or force and say you condemn it and use it. So I found myself disagreeing with the policy of my party, the policy advocated by my friends in this House. I declined to accept it. I have the greatest admiration, affection, and respect for the man in the White House. I think he is one of the greatest Presidents whom we have had in many decades in this country—a sincere, true patriot. I do not propose and have not proposed to indulge in any sycophantic praise of him. I took my political life in my hands in the primaries in 1912 in my district in advocating his nomination, and some who are now shouting his praises were fiercely attacking him.

I stood up for him and carried my particular section for him in the primary. I thought in 1912, as I think now, that he was the best man of all the candidates we could nominate for the Presidency and the only man we could elect. He is a manly man; he has opinions of his own, and when occasion arose which called upon him to do so he asserted those principles and voted them or remained quiet and did not support the candidates who represented the principles he could not accept. I claim the same right to vote and voice those principles that I have believed in all my life, whether in the Democratic caucus or in the House. I exercised this right in the Democratic caucus. The Democratic caucus has formulated a rule by which a man who could not support a measure that contravenes his view of the Constitution of the United States or which violates the pledge which he had made to his people could be excused from supporting a caucus measure.

But these small men who undertake to enlarge their proportions by standing in the glaring light that beats around the White House go around and glibly talk about "bolters." They want front seats and front places in the White House light; they who hold up their hands and shout, like Demetrius of old, "Great, great is Diana of the Ephesians." So they shout, "Great, great is Woodrow Wilson in the White House." [Applause.]

As Demetrius said when St. Paul undertook to tell him about the Christian religion and the wonders which Christ and His disciples had worked, when he undertook to preach the doctrine of Christianity, Demetrius urged the people to stone him because it interfered with Demetrius's business. And so these shouters for Wilson would have it done to us. I do not care if they stone me like Demetrius would have stoned St. Paul because we interfered with their business of patronage. [Laughter and applause.] Why, I am ready to be stoned; I am ready to be pilloried in the white light of public opinion of my State and of my constituency; and if I can not show them that I stood for the faith of the fathers, that I exercised a right that a Democratic caucus gave me when we organized the Democratic caucus, then I must accept the consequences; but I would rather wrap the robes of private station around me and retire to my home and serve the balance of my life as a private citizen than to be forced by any sort of demand to lose my respect.

I can lose office and be satisfied. I can lose the good opinion or approval of those men who have one opinion to-day and another to-morrow, but I can not go to my home and my people with my self-respect gone, and tell them that I did it by the dictation of anybody, and I will not do it. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to extend my remarks, by putting in extracts from the National Magazine, which gives a statement of the various instances where States

have undertaken government ownership of railroads and have failed. I ask to put that in.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the manner indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The article referred to is as follows:

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF UTILITIES.
(By William Clayton.)

"Government ownership and operation is not an entirely new proposition in this country, for minor ventures were made as far back as colonial days, most of which were financial failures. Prior to 1860 appropriations exceeding \$12,000,000 had been made by Congress for the construction of Government-owned transportation projects, but the most searching investigations which students of political economy have made have brought to light nothing remarkable except the fact that no financial success followed these undertakings.

"The older States have had the most disappointing experience with practically every project they have launched, and a very interesting volume could be compiled from the records of government owned and operated canals in some of the Eastern States. The figures would be appalling, and they would indicate a waste of money far beyond all reason. Outside of New York State the great majority of canal projects have either been abandoned or turned over to private ownership; and even in New York State no one would venture to assert that the canals have been other than a gigantic failure except so far as they have assisted in the development of the territory through which they were built. As enterprises standing alone, the financial losses have been colossal.

"History shows that several American States have owned and operated steam railroads, only to abandon them as unprofitable and therefore unsuccessful. The only Government railroads in this country to-day are the Panama Railroad, operated by the Federal Government, and a short road in Texas known as the Penitentiary line. (The apparent success of Government operation of the Panama Railroad is due to excessively high rates and monopolization of the traffic. For instance, the Panama Railroad's average freight rate in the fiscal year 1913 was a trifle short of 3½ cents per ton per mile, which was more than four times greater than the average of the privately owned railroads of the United States—three-quarters of a cent per ton per mile.) Georgia and North Carolina own certain railroads, which were built several years ago, but they are now leased and operated by private companies. Before going out of the railroad business these States encountered disastrous experiences in the operation of the system. Probably no better account of an unsuccessful experience may be found than the story told by Hon. T. B. Wamock, formerly judge of the Supreme Court of North Carolina, who wrote, in 1906: 'This road (from Goldsboro to Morehead City) has been operated by the State of North Carolina for nearly half a century, in war and peace, by Democrats, by Republicans, and by fusionists, with various degrees of failure.

"The private stockholders for years have pleaded for a lease or anything to avoid a continuance of political mismanagement. During these many years no dividend has been earned, though one or two presidents declared dividends of 1 or 2 per cent per annum for political effect, when such moneys should have been used in betterments. Finally, during the administration of Gov. Aycock, it became known that the administration had determined to heed the cries of the private stockholders and the sound business judgment of the people of the State and to lease this last of the State's railroads. A great sigh of relief went up from mountain to sea. The effect of the lease was immediate. The first year of private management improved the roadbed and equipment to a point never before approached. The road is being extended and new connections made and is run upon business as opposed to political methods. The service, both passenger and freight, has been nearly doubled, and favoritism has been abolished."

"The experience of Cincinnati, which owns the Cincinnati & Southern Railroad, has been nothing but unsatisfactory from a financial standpoint.

"Missouri has had a most unfortunate experience in railroad construction and operation, and it is stated that its losses in this line of endeavor amount to approximately \$25,000,000.

"The State of Pennsylvania is said to have lost about \$20,000,000 in its railway projects. This loss resulted from its experience with the old Philadelphia & Columbia Railroad.

"Indiana started out in the late thirties to demonstrate its faith in public ownership, but, after a year's experience as an owner and operator of the Madison & Lafayette road, frankly admitted its failure and stopped the losses after a million and a half had been sunk in the enterprises.

"These illustrations are not the only unsuccessful experiences that American States have encountered with public ownership and operation. Unfortunately, a complete story of these failures has never been written, and as many of them occurred before our present generation the precedents have not been sufficiently considered. When these failures are better understood they will aid in forming correct conclusions regarding the wisdom of municipalizing everything in sight.

"The commissioner of accounts of the city of New York recently reported to the mayor that the net loss from operating the Staten Island ferry for seven years was \$4,450,699. The city's loss on the Staten Island ferry proper, coupled with the loss on what is known as the Thirty-ninth Street division, a Brooklyn ferry, has been \$6,625,000, an average of \$2,934 a day. Gazing at these figures, and then contemplating the fact that these ferries paid when they were privately operated, can not but dampen the ardor of any municipal ownership enthusiast.

"Every government of municipal enterprise is exposed to political outbidding of one politician by another. Government employees become electoral factors in proportion to the increase of Government and municipal activities. They become the actual masters of those to whom in theory they are subservient.

"In the Municipal Trading Report, Sir Thomas Hughes, twice mayor of Liverpool, states: 'The day on which a man becomes the employee of a municipal corporation he ought to have no further voice in the choice of his superiors.'

"The New York World recently states:

"Nominally the civil-service employees of New York are public servants. In reality they are public masters.

"The original civil-service laws were enacted to protect faithful public servants from political bosses and to safeguard the public business from the demoralization of public welfare. We have protected all these employees from the boss, but we have got to devise means to protect the public from its employees. No corporation would dare take the aggressive stand against public regulation that these civil-service employees take.

"New York has a written charter, but it is only a matter of form. The real charter of New York is to be found in the decrees of 60,000 and more civil-service employees, all organized against their employers, the people of New York. They are all despots of our democracy."

"One difficulty common to most forms of government ownership arises from the necessity of dealing with a large number of employees. The tasks of a government, whether it be a nation or a municipality, are sufficiently varied and comprehensive to take up all the ability and time of the administrators, without adding unnecessarily to their duties. In public ownership there is a multiplication of the activities of government which brings about vexatious interference with liberty and a restriction upon legitimate enterprises. In other words, instead of the liberties of the people being protected they are curtailed."

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I make a similar request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I make a similar request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the payment of pensions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes, namely:

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] may proceed for 10 minutes as though it were in general debate.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I hope that will be done, and I join with the gentleman from Illinois in that request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] may proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I am obliged to the gentleman from Illinois, also the gentleman from Georgia, for this courtesy at this time. It is rather belated, since what I have to say could have been more appropriately said at the time the discussion was on. I rise now to say a word or two with respect

to a practice that has grown up here of criticizing men who are not present. I do not mean to reflect upon the gentleman from Georgia, for instance, who has just made a very severe attack upon my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER], inviting a reply that I presume, in due course, will be made in defense of the child-labor bill, but I do think some Member in this House should rise when a statement is being made about an individual who is not here, which statement involves a charge of corruption concerning individuals who are not present to defend themselves.

Now, I have no desire to question the motives of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TAVENNER]. He has started out on a line of investigation which is special to his particular district and he endeavors to broaden it so that it will attract general attention. But when he comes into the House and asks leave to have read a statement, which statement he represents to be a response to a very lengthy attack made by him in the RECORD, and which does not upon its face appear to be a statement of the person to whom it is attributed, it is entirely regular, fair and just that some one—it happened to be me in this instance—should rise and question the authenticity of the statement.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 15 our very industrious colleague from Illinois [Mr. TAVENNER] inserted a speech of more than 22 pages in length, which is a direct attack upon the War and the Navy Departments, and which throughout breathes the spirit of corruption and of graft, and which in some instances directly asserts that officers of the Government serving under our distinguished Democratic President, Woodrow Wilson, are in league with certain trusts and combinations for the purpose of making money and making it corruptly.

Mr. TAVENNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I can not yield just now. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TAVENNER], having gone thus far in the RECORD, proceeds this morning, under time granted to him by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT], to have read an article from a newspaper, which, according to his statement, is in answer to his lengthy speech of February 15. The gentleman from Illinois stated in his address of this morning—a stenographic copy of this address being before me—that he, the gentleman from Illinois, having called attention to the fact that—

Four firms, which constitute the War Trust of this country, have drawn down \$175,000,000 worth of contracts from the Government for munitions of war, and that Army and Navy officers have permitted these four concerns to outrageously overcharge the Government for every dollar's worth of those supplies—

therefore he calls attention to the fact that Gen. Crozier—and that comes very close to an implication that Gen. Crozier is one of the officers who is permitting the Government to be "outrageously charged"—

That Gen. Crozier, the present Chief of Ordnance, who does the buying of these supplies for the Army, was formerly in partnership with the Bethlehem Steel Co.; that he was in partnership with them on the day he was made Chief of Ordnance—

And so forth. Having made this fling, the gentleman from Illinois says:

My attention has been directed to an answer by Gen. Crozier to the charges which I have made, and I think, in fairness to Gen. Crozier and in order that his views may be in the RECORD, as mine have been placed in the RECORD—

And so forth. That this alleged statement by the general should be read from the Clerk's desk, and so forth.

Now, it was patent to every Member who listened to the newspaper article which the gentleman sent up to the Clerk's desk to be read that it did not emanate from Gen. Crozier; that it was just as I said when breaking into the reading of the article, observing that it was unfair, that the article itself represents a man of straw set up to be knocked down. That is to say, the gentleman from Illinois, having made his charges, 22 pages in length, which charges have not been responded to, discovers a newspaper dispatch saying that Gen. Crozier contemplated doing so and so, and that Gen. Crozier might reply. That is the only basis for the statement of the gentleman from Illinois that Gen. Crozier proposed to do anything.

I said that this was not a fair method of procedure, and I was interrupted by certain calls from the floor, indicating that I was very much out of order and that I ought not to proceed. Now, in the speech of the gentleman from Illinois of February 15, after he has roasted Gen. Crozier, he says very much as he says in offering this newspaper statement about this man of straw, this bugaboo that he intends to knock down:

I do not desire to do Gen. Crozier the slightest injustice, and, on the other hand, I am equally anxious that no injustice be done the taxpayers of this country.

He compliments the general, but he proceeds to lambast him just about as severely as a first-class, energetic newspaper writer is capable of doing, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TAVENNER] is all that.

Now, in the course of my effort to reply briefly to the newspaper statement that was read, in order to explain that it was not a statement from Gen. Crozier, in order to have it appear in the RECORD that something was being used that was not, apparently, furnished by Gen. Crozier, there came certain objections, cries of "Sit down," cries of "the gentleman is out of order," suggestions, and catcalls from Members who did not address the Chair that I "should take my seat"; suggestions that I was the representative of the Steel Trust. Although some of them were undoubtedly jocular, these suggestions about the trusts came from the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], from the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TAVENNER], from the distinguished and always deliberate gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER], and they also came with some explosive violence from the distinguished Democratic interrupter of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON].

These gentlemen said that because I was endeavoring to play fair and have the House do the decent thing toward a Federal officer under a Democratic administration, who was not here, that I was speaking in the interest of trusts and combinations. Of course, to me that insinuation is the veriest joke. To my constituents it would be laughable. Those who know me and have watched me here know that I have been as outspoken on this floor against illegal trusts and combinations as any Democrat ever dared to be. I have not even fallen in with the more recent Democratic notions that the Shipping Trust must be taken care of by the purchase of foreign ships; that the Railroad Trust must be taken care of, even from the White House, by increasing the freight rates in order that the railroads may have larger profits; that the Oil Trust and the Cotton Trust may have more protection by the purchase of ships to enable them to make more money; that the great shippers and exporters of the country must have an insurance company, paid for by the money of the people, in order that exporters may loot the people a little. All these things I have not fallen in with under this Democratic administration. I have protested against the modern Democratic forgetfulness of the common people of the land and their falling into hands of the trusts. I have wondered why they did it, whether it was for the purpose of securing campaign funds or not I do not know. It may have been to get on the right side of the "big interests" with the hope of continuing the last Democratic administration for another term.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I will not yield. I have not been able to agree with the gentlemen who represent the trusts of this country upon the Democratic side of this House—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT. I hope it will be granted.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. MOORE. Well, as the gentleman is the special representative of the President of the United States, who recently received 62 representatives of the "big interests" in order that a better understanding might be had as to how the business of the country could be restored and normal conditions be resumed, I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman infer that the President of the United States coerced the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Mr. MOORE. Oh, I make no such intimation. It is a fact, however, and the gentleman may ponder over it, that after the railroad presidents of the United States visited the White House and told the President their troubles, the President of the United States did issue a statement, saying that the railroads ought to have consideration, and that the freight rates ought to be increased. It has happened that the Interstate Commerce Commission has taken the same view of the situation that the President did, and has granted an increase of rates. Under a Democratic administration that formerly stood for the down-trodden people of the land and was forever against private monopolies, and particularly against railroad domination, that is pretty good.

Mr. WALSH. Let the gentleman be fair to the President, and say—

Mr. MOORE. That is as far as I can yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman ought to know that he did not coerce the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. MOORE. I did not say so. If the gentleman is going to be the President's sole defender on this floor—

Mr. WALSH. I do not pretend to be the President's sole defender on this floor—

Mr. MOORE. Why, then the gentleman will be the only Democrat who has responded to the Washington Post's Macedonian cry for help from Democratic Members to stand up and defend the President against the so-called vicious attacks that the Republicans are poking into the present administration. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman should be fair.

Mr. MOORE. I am as fair as I can be under the circumstances. People who were prosperous in the gentleman's own district under the last Republican administration are now out of work. The people employed in the potteries up there are now seeking employment. They lost it because they voted for the gentleman's friend, now the President of the United States. They had the false notion that they could have continued prosperity under a low-tariff system. The gentleman knows that very well, because the slogan of the gentleman's campaign was "Walsh works with Wilson"; the result was that Walsh was left at home. I think the people of Trenton will verify that.

Mr. WALSH. Sometimes merit is not recognized at first, and there is still hope. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MOORE. The outlook is not very cheerful.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. Gladly, if the gentleman will give me more time.

Mr. BARTLETT. I want to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Does the gentleman think that a real Democrat at any time takes suggestions from the Washington Post as to what a Democrat ought to do?

Mr. MOORE. Well, sometimes the Post speaks out only in the interest of the Democratic Party. Its editor and proprietor is an excellent Democrat; he gives the party good advice from time to time. [Laughter.]

It seems to me that it ought to be stated now, in view of the protests that arose from the Democratic side a moment ago against a Republican Member daring to take his feet to even ask for fair play for a Democratic officeholder, that we ought to find out the origin of the case. I do not know whether Gen. Crozier is a Republican or a Democrat, and I do not care. I have not taken the trouble to call up Gen. Crozier or any of his friends to find out what his attitude is on these charges that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TAVENNER] has brought against him. I do not know whether he knows that his name was used in this body to-day or not. I speak only in the interest of fair play, and just now I am endeavoring to trace the origin of the man whom the Democrats did not want defended on this floor a little while ago, but whom they apparently desired to denounce, and whom they would connect with the great trusts of this country.

Let us see where he came from. I understand he was a captain in the Bureau of Ordnance some years ago, and that he was the inventor of what is called the disappearing gun carriage. I am not going into details, because they are technical, and I have not the finesse in that regard of my distinguished friend from Alabama, Capt. Hobson. But in a departmental report signed by the Hon. Daniel S. Lamont, Secretary of War, and a very clever Democrat he was, I find this—the report was for the year 1894:

The establishment of type disappearing gun carriages for 8-inch and 10-inch guns, invented by officers of the Ordnance Corps and believed to be unequalled for rapidity and simplicity of action by any carriage elsewhere in use, is a notable achievement of the year. This problem solved, the armament of our harbors may now be prosecuted as rapidly as means are available.

At the date of the last annual report of the department a selection of a type carriage for 8 and 10 inch guns was expected within a few months. Since then the 8-inch Buffington-Crozier disappearing carriage has been tried with results, as stated by the Board of Ordnance, exceeding for rapidity and smoothness of operation the most sanguine expectations of this board. The carriage is the combined invention of Col. Buffington and Capt. Crozier, of the Ordnance Department, and reflects credit on the inventive skill of American officers.

It is a satisfactory solution of one of the most difficult problems which has confronted military science.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, Daniel S. Lamont signed this report. He was a Democrat. It was indorsed by Grover Cleve-

land, a great Democratic President; and the origin of the scandal against Col. Buffington and Capt. Crozier started with the Democratic administration in 1894. [Applause on the Republican side.]

In extending these remarks, Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that the charges of the gentleman from Illinois seem to have been exploded long ago. The Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations and the House itself have grown tired of thrashing over this matter. If there was anything wrong with Gen. Crozier, why did Grover Cleveland in his annual message to Congress, December 7, 1896, referring to the invention of Capt. Crozier, say this:

During the same year, immediately preceding the message referred to, the first modern gun carriage has been completed and 11 more were in process of construction. All but one were of the nondisappearing type. These, however, were not such as to secure necessary cover for artillery gunners against the intense fire of modern machine rapid-fire and high-power guns.

The inventive genius of ordnance and civilian experts has been taxed in designing carriages that would obviate this fault, resulting, it is believed, in the solution of this difficult problem.

Apparently Gen. Crozier has had the confidence of every administration from the days of Grover Cleveland down to the present time. He appears to have the confidence of the administration of Woodrow Wilson, and I am at a loss to understand why, if he began with Cleveland and continues under Wilson, there should be any good reason for refusing him a decent hearing in a Democratic House of Representatives. It is not my case; it is yours.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. HOBSON. Which gentleman from Alabama?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN].

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] asks unanimous consent to extend and revise his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, a good many things have been said about the President coercing the Democrats into supporting the shipping bill. I think I know the sentiment on this side. Two-thirds of the Democrats over here were for the bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Two-thirds?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes; and only 16 excused themselves, and of those, only 14 finally voted against the bill. The Progressives on that side voted with us, and I am not sure but that one or two Republicans did.

A MEMBER. Oh, no.

Mr. HEFLIN. Well, the Republicans may have voted solidly against the bill.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes.

Mr. TEMPLE. I know the gentleman wants to be accurate. Five Progressives voted for the bill and seven voted against it.

Mr. HEFLIN. Well, then, Mr. Chairman, that is one time that the minority of the Progressives were in the right, and the majority was in the wrong. [Applause.]

I knew the bulk of the Republican Party stood that way. The President of the United States does not need any defense at the hands of anybody here. His great work speaks for itself. The Republican Party is taking advantage of a distressing condition that exists in this country on account of war. One half the world is at war and business is disturbed along various lines. You are playing politics at a time when you ought to be supporting, with all your heart and head, this great chief in the White House. You are undertaking at this time to play politics; but, gentlemen, it is going to turn on you, and we are going to turn it on you in the campaign of 1916. The people will have learned long before then that conditions which are distressing business were brought about by the war in Europe. You are going to tell them and you have been telling them that it is caused by the tariff. Canada has a high tariff, and yet business is in an awful fix in Canada, and it is war that has caused it. War has injured conditions there just as war has injured conditions here.

Mr. FOWLER. Has not Germany the highest protective tariff of any country in the Eastern Hemisphere?

Mr. HEFLIN. And yet gentlemen will say that the war had nothing to do with disturbed business conditions in Germany. They would say that it is the Democratic Party in the United States that has done it, and that is what they would

have the people believe. But you can not fool the people with these things.

The President of the United States is fighting the greatest trust on the earth, the Shipping Trust. It is owned by people who live in foreign countries, and you gentlemen have shown your great friendship and sympathy for the people here by supporting the foreign Shipping Trust. You will also have that to meet in the next campaign. And the obstacles which you are trying now to place before this great man of peace in the White House will rise up to haunt you in the next campaign. Let me appeal to your patriotism once. Cease this effort at a political play and put the good of your country and the good of the American people one time above your insatiate desire to return to power. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I did not know that general debate was going to be continued on this subject. I have no objection.

In what I had to say a few minutes ago I stated my position upon a certain proposition, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] has repeated the language of the street, which we hear so often from those who do genuflections and swing censers before the President of the United States, that those who opposed the shipping bill were actuated by friendship for and interest in the Shipping Trust. That does not refer to me; but since the suggestion has been made I will ask, Where is the Shipping Trust in the country? It is the coastwise trade, and everybody knows it. Who are the people who have stood in the way? I do not mean Members of Congress. I never reflect upon the views or motives of Members of the House. Men who have honor and character enough to receive the votes of their constituencies and to be entitled to seats in this Congress are above suspicion of their motives and ought not to have their motives or their votes questioned, unless some proof can be brought against them. I despise that sort of argument and criticism against Congress, and I take it for granted that every Member of this House is as honest in his motives as I am, and I would resent the suggestion that I am in any way influenced in my vote.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. BARTLETT. I can not yield. I will yield in a moment. But the country knows and everybody knows that those of us who could not give our support to the shipping bill in the caucus agreed to support it if gentlemen would agree to make it temporary and would strike a blow at the great Shipping Trust—the coastwise trade—and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] and the people who thought as he did, headed by him, voted it down. We got 58 votes for it, but it was voted down. Now, "let the galled jade wince. My withers are unwrung."

Mr. HEFLIN. I should like to interrupt the gentleman.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. HEFLIN. Does not the gentleman from Georgia know—I want to state to him that I did not have him in mind.

Mr. BARTLETT. I know you did not. You ought not to have had anybody in mind.

Mr. HEFLIN. I did not have the gentleman in mind. I was replying to the eloquent speech of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], and had no reference to the gentleman from Georgia at all.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say this in reply to the gentleman from Georgia—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HEFLIN. I want just an opportunity to speak for two minutes. I did not intend to cast any reflection on the gentleman from Georgia. I ask unanimous consent that I may have two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEFLIN. The gentleman refers to what occurred in the caucus, about making a limitation on this purchase of ships. I want to say to the gentleman that that is exactly what the trust wanted. Whenever he asks this Congress to set a time to sell these ships, the trust rejoices, because it knows that nobody but the trust will bid and buy, and we did not want the Government to be helpless in the hands of the trust when it got ready to dispose of these vessels. We did what we thought was right. We followed the suggestion of the Senate Democrats, of the President in the White House, and the majority of the Democrats on this side. It has become the policy of the Democratic Party, and I choose to stand beneath the unfurled flag of my party, and I will stand and fight in the open, with Woodrow Wilson and four-fifths of the Democratic Senators and nine-tenths of the Democrats in this House. That is where I stand on this proposition. [Applause.]

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I choose to stand with my party. I always did. I stood for it, I apprehend, when the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] was in his swaddling clothes. I do not propose to permit him or anyone else to say where I shall stand, nor do I propose to permit him or men who entertain views not Democratic, and not drawn from Democratic sources, to drive me out of the Democratic Party. They may go, but I shall stay. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For Army and Navy pensions, as follows: For invalids, widows, minor children, and dependent relatives, Army nurses, and all other pensioners who are now borne on the rolls, or who may hereafter be placed thereon, under the provisions of any and all acts of Congress, \$165,000,000: *Provided*, That the appropriation aforesaid for Navy pensions shall be paid from the income of the Navy pension fund, so far as the same shall be sufficient for that purpose: *Provided further*, That the amount expended under each of the above items shall be accounted for separately.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 2, line 1, by striking out the figures \$165,000,000 and inserting in lieu thereof \$164,000,000.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, according to the report of the Commissioner of Pensions there remained at the end of the last fiscal year \$7,658,572.87 surplus of the \$169,000,000 appropriated under the bill of that year. When the commissioner was before the committee that was preparing this bill he stated positively at that time that he was satisfied that \$165,000,000 would be sufficient. Since that time he has further information, and on February 5, 1915, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations received this letter:

DEAR MR. FITZGERALD: I understand that your committee has made a reduction of \$166,000,000 to \$165,000,000 in the appropriation for pensions during the fiscal year 1916. It will be entirely safe to make a further reduction of \$1,000,000 from this amount, making the appropriation \$164,000,000.

Cordially, yours,

That information was obtained after the committee had made its report to this House, and, therefore, following the suggestion of the Commissioner of Pensions and the Secretary of the Interior, I have offered this amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman inform the committee what is the annual reduction in the pension fund occasioned by the deaths of the old soldiers?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes; it is in the report.

Mr. STAFFORD. I notice here that in 1912 the reduction was \$4,319,000. I presume it is much higher this year.

Mr. BARTLETT. The number of deaths during the year 1914 was 33,639.

Mr. STAFFORD. What were the total reductions occasioned by those deaths?

Mr. BARTLETT. It left a balance, as I stated to the gentleman, of \$7,658,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. If I understood the gentleman, he stated \$169,000,000 were appropriated, and there was a surplus of \$7,000,000.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes; that was the surplus. They did not pay it out.

Mr. STAFFORD. That would leave a balance of \$161,000,000.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. And yet, notwithstanding the surplus, you are appropriating \$164,000,000 instead of \$161,000,000, and not taking into account the savings that will result by the increasing deaths of the old soldiers as the years go by. Does not the gentleman think there will be still a surplus of many million dollars if we appropriate \$164,000,000?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes; I do; and if the gentleman will offer an amendment to make it \$161,000,000 I will vote for it.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is in charge of the bill.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am in charge of a bill that has been agreed to by a committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. From the figures presented by the gentleman for last year we appropriated \$169,000,000, and there was a surplus of \$7,000,000. That means that only \$162,000,000 are necessary, and certainly with the continued deaths the figure that would be sufficient would be below \$160,000,000. It does not require any argument to show that, because in 1912 the reductions in pensions occasioned by deaths at that time amounted to \$4,338,000, and certainly as the age increases the reduction increases also.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is true. I endeavored to do that. I read from the hearings at page 8:

Mr. BARTLETT. Is it likely that you would have as much unexpended balance at the end of the next fiscal year as you had at the end of the last fiscal year?

Mr. SALTZGABER. No, sir; I hardly anticipate that much, because the appropriation has been reduced all the time.

Mr. BARTLETT. You will have as much ratably or comparatively?

Mr. SALTZGABER. That is pretty hard to answer. I do not know just the meaning of the word "ratably" in that connection.

Mr. BARTLETT. In other words, if on an appropriation of \$169,000,000 you saved \$7,658,000, on an appropriation of \$166,000,000 you would save as much, would you not?

Mr. SALTZGABER. No, sir; not necessarily. The amount required is diminishing, but the estimate was made \$3,000,000 less to start with on that account. Now, as I have said to you, probably less than that will be required, though just how much less is a matter of speculation.

Mr. BARTLETT. If we give you \$165,000,000, that will meet all the requirements?

Mr. SALTZGABER. I think that will be all right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Page 2, line 6, after the word "separately," insert:

"From and after July 1, 1916, no pension shall be paid to any person who resides in a foreign country, and who is not a citizen of the United States, except for actual disabilities incurred in the service."

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I feel reasonably sure, from the discussion and comments which this amendment has received, that it represents the real sentiment of the American soldiers themselves. I am certain that it represents the sentiment of the rest of the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Why does the gentleman put this off to July 1, 1916? Why does he not make it effective July 1, 1915?

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Kentucky that this amendment was considered in the Sixty-second Congress and was very vigorously opposed by some of the gentlemen on the opposite side of the House. One of the questions they raised was whether the department could get ready to put it into force during the current year. In my own judgment it can be put into force, and I have drawn and will offer, if this amendment is defeated, a limitation upon the existing appropriation. I am not sure but that both ought to go in, but I am perfectly certain that no possible injustice can result if we give them the fiscal year in which to ascertain and prepare for this change.

Mr. BARKLEY. They have now nearly five months before this appropriation becomes available.

Mr. BORLAND. That is true; but this amendment will get more votes than the amendment the gentleman has in mind. I know that from experience.

Mr. GOULDEN. What is the opinion of the Commissioner of Pensions upon this subject?

Mr. BORLAND. The opinion of the Commissioner of Pensions is very decidedly in favor of this amendment. I quoted that in my speech this afternoon, and I have it here in the hearings on page 21. The present Commissioner of Pensions is an old soldier and has the confidence and respect of the entire body of old soldiers of this country. I read from the hearings:

Mr. DAVIS. I would like to ask a formal question, and I do not ask the commissioner to answer it if he does not desire to do so: In your judgment, Mr. Commissioner, is it proper for a man who rendered service in the Civil War or any other military service for the United States Government, and who because of that service was placed upon the pension roll, to be deprived of that pension because of the fact that subsequently he declared his allegiance to some other country than the United States? In your opinion, Mr. Commissioner, should or should not that fact bar him from receiving the pension that he obtained as a service pension because of his service to the United States? You need not answer that question if you prefer not to do so.

Mr. SALTZGABER. I have an opinion on the subject, and it is this: I am so thoroughly American that I believe that a man who abjures his allegiance to this country ought not to receive any reward from it.

So that the present Commissioner of Pensions has a clear-cut opinion which he does not hesitate to express. I am very glad to find that my colleague from New York, Mr. GOULDEN, an old soldier in the Union cause, and my colleague from Ohio, Gen. SHERWOOD, agree very heartily in the absolute justice of this provision and the relative justice of it to the old soldiers who remain under the American flag and who contribute to the expenses of the American Government.

They have no sentiment, such as gentlemen who have opposed this in the past seem to think, that this is some kind of an injustice to the American soldier. In fact they take the opposite view, that this is an act of justice to the American

soldier, who, in the last analysis, through himself, his sons, and family pay the taxes out of which these pensions must be paid.

Mr. FOWLER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. Would not the gentleman's amendment deprive a widow of a pension whose husband fought for the preservation of our Union, who now lives say in Ireland or Canada? Would it not deprive them of pensions?

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, that objection has been raised also and made much of; and I want to say to my friend from Illinois, whom I know is perfectly sincere in asking the question, that as long ago as 1893, when this matter first came up, the question was raised then whether some of the widows or dependent mothers of soldiers who were foreigners and never became citizens of the Nation would not be affected by this provision. At that time, in 1893, there were less than 3,000 of these foreigners drawing pensions, whereas to-day there are over 5,000 of them. Now, the gentleman will see that if there are any widows in Ireland, or dependent mothers, their number ought to decrease very rapidly after the war and not increase at this rate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask that I may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BORLAND. My own judgment is this: That while there may be some widows remaining—I doubt whether there are any dependent mothers—if there may be some widows remaining in foreign countries whose husbands came here and fought and died under the American flag, we could very easily take care of those cases by special bills; in fact, when that question was put to the commissioner as to how we could deal with exceptional cases of foreigners who ought to have some reward from the Federal Treasury he said the way to deal with it was by a special bill in Congress. And these special bills would not amount to anything near the million dollars we are now dispensing. Another point that the commissioner made is this: We provided in the last bill—Sixty-second Congress—that pensions should be paid by checks instead of by vouchers. Well, that saved a good deal of time and some expense to the pensioner in getting his money and the trouble of going down and signing the voucher. It was an awful fight to get that through. I happened to be one of the conferees on the part of the House, and it took us three or four months, against a most bitter fight of these men who are capitalizing this pension business all over the country, to get that kind of an amendment into the law. Yet the commissioner says to-day that there is a saving made of \$145,000 in the annual expense of running his office every year; and not only that, but it saves from one to eight days' time of pensioner in getting his money and he saves the expense and trouble of executing his voucher.

In addition to that, he says that that safeguard can not be extended to foreign pensioners; that he must continue to pay by voucher to foreign countries because there is no way of applying our fraud laws to a foreign country. If somebody over there continues to get a pension check after the pensioner died and continues to cash it, we can never reach him until some casual information comes through some American consul or otherwise that that pension ought to be stopped. That there is no way of our controlling that in foreign countries—

Mr. SHERWOOD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. SHERWOOD. In answer to the objection of the gentleman from Illinois, I will state it in this way: I heard the argument made by the gentleman from Tennessee a year ago on this question. Now, if there are any of these Irish widows, or widows of other countries, who are deserving of a pension, I will agree to get a private pension for every one of them.

Mr. BORLAND. They could very easily obtain them. But the main point is this: We might as well solve this question now as at any other time. We could not get into a war with any country on the globe without finding part of our own money, and perhaps men who are drawing pensions from this Government, under arms opposing us. It would perhaps be voluntary and perhaps by draft, but at least we would be fought by our own men and our own money. No nation in the world has ever done that or ever ought to do it, and we ought not to continue to do it.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I interrupt the gentleman just a moment?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. The Commissioner of Pensions, at the suggestion of the committee, has prepared a letter, which can be

read, that would reach the situation by asking certain questions.

Mr. BORLAND. I will say, Mr. Chairman, that I have seen this letter prepared by the commissioner, and I will ask to have it inserted in the RECORD, so that it may be before the House. It consists of four questions. The commissioner says it would be very easy in sending out the next pensions to foreign countries to insert the letter, and have it returned with the answers, and that the expense would be but trifling.

Mr. COOPER. Would the gentleman read those questions?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; I will. I may overrun my time.

Mr. BARTLETT. I will give you more time.

Mr. BORLAND. It says:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF PENSIONS,
Washington, _____.

Please answer the following questions for the information of the Congress of the United States, and return this circular in the same envelope with your next voucher for pension.

Commissioner of Pensions.

1. Where were you born?
2. Name the countries in which you have resided since your birth, and the years of your residence in each country.
3. Of what country are you now a citizen?
4. Were you ever a citizen of any other country; and if so, name the country and State, how you became a citizen thereof, and how your citizenship was terminated?

Signature: _____

Post-office address: } _____

Now, there are four simple questions. It discloses exactly what Congress wants to know, whether this pensioner was ever a citizen of the United States, and whether—

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield? I want to ask the gentleman a question, which, with his answer, will, I think, embody the whole argument. Does the gentleman believe that it would have been wrong for the Government of the United States to pension Von Steuben, the German, or Lafayette and Rochambeau, the Frenchmen, or Kosciuszko and Pulaski, the Poles, who helped to win our freedom, and then went back to Europe?

Mr. BORLAND. Congress, I think, did vote special ones to each of those gentlemen.

Mr. COOPER. Yes; it did. And why should it not have pensioned them as long as they lived? [Applause.]

Mr. GORDON. They are all dead.

Mr. BORLAND. That is not the question involved.

Mr. COOPER. Some of these other men came from Europe and helped 50 years ago to save the flag of the United States, and ought to be pensioned as long as they live, and wherever they live, for the same reason exactly. [Applause.]

Mr. BORLAND. That very question was asked Mr. Saltzgeber, the Commissioner of Pensions, and my recollection is that it appears in the hearings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes' extension.

Mr. MANN. How long is this going to run?

Mr. BORLAND. No longer than five minutes, so far as I know, unless some other gentleman wishes to speak.

Mr. FOWLER. I want some time.

Mr. BORLAND. Does the gentleman want to agree to time?

Mr. MANN. Oh, no. I just simply wanted an explanation.

Mr. BARTLETT. I did not want to make an explanation while the gentleman was on the floor.

Mr. BORLAND. I want to have the attention of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER], because I do not want him to base upon exceptional cases a general rule. I do not want him to come here and say that there might be some distinguished gentleman that ought to be recognized, and that that is a good reason why a lot of men who expatriate themselves and take up homesteads in Canada ought to continue to draw pensions. Listen to what the commissioner said about that:

Mr. SALZGABER. I think that if there is any foreigner who came to this country and rendered service to it in the time of its peril, if that service was of conspicuous merit it would be a matter for Congress to deal with.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. SHERWOOD. That is what they did with Lafayette when he came over here. The Congress gave him \$110,000 in gold.

Mr. BORLAND. There is no question but that Congress should deal with those cases. But we should not ask the American taxpayer to pay a lot of pensions to men who have abandoned this country.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, it was only a few years since that Congress put a man—a prominent Democrat, I think—Gen. Osterhaus, on the retired list as major general. He does

not draw a pension. He draws the pay of a retired major general. I believe he lives in Germany. I would not take it away from him. Would you?

Mr. COOPER. No.

Mr. MANN. It was only recently that you on that side of the House voted to put him in that class. The proposition came from the Democrats of his drawing the pay of a retired major general, but your proposition is that if some poor German came over and fought for the preservation of this Union and went back home, and is drawing \$12 a month, you will take it away from him. But you leave the general to draw \$7,500 a year.

Mr. BORLAND. Would it not be better for the gentleman to leave politics out of this?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman had 15 minutes. Let me have a few minutes. I did not interrupt the gentleman.

Mr. BORLAND. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman without his consent.

Mr. MANN. Let me proceed for a moment. This proposition has been before this House on several occasions. Everybody knows it will not become a part of the law when this bill is passed. I do not believe that it will pass this House. It certainly will not pass the Senate at this session.

We are trying to avoid on this side of the House a special session, but gentlemen on that side keep injecting propositions that may cause one. What are the facts in the case? There are 5,163 of these pensioners living in foreign lands, and their pensions amount to a little over \$1,000,000. That is \$200 a person on the average. More than half of them live in Canada. Those in Canada consist of two classes: First, the men or their widows who came over the border during the war and volunteered, with no obligation except the moral desire to help preserve the Union. [Applause on the Republican side.] Do we owe them nothing? They came from a foreign country to fight for us. Do we owe them nothing? The other class consists of American citizens who have since the war gone to Canada, in the Northwest, in the hope that they may better their condition by taking homesteads there. They fought for the Union. Are we, in their older age, when they have gone out to help make the prairies bloom with crops, to take away from them our little pittance that we give to them?

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. MANN. No; not yet. Wait a moment. Nearly one-tenth of these pensioners live in Ireland. The Irish blood is always for liberty. [Applause.] They are always ready to fight for liberty. [Renewed applause.] They came over here as young men and fought in behalf of the country. Probably most of these pensioners are their widows who have gone back to the Green Island to spend their last days, being meanwhile dependent on the little pension of \$12 per month which we pay them. Do you propose to take that away from them? That is what this amendment does.

And nearly one-tenth of these pensioners are in Germany. Do we propose now, in this condition, to take away from those pensioners in that land the little pension that we pay to them, when they were willing to help us in our hour of need and war? And will we repay them, when they need this little pittance, when they are at war, by taking it away from them? That would be base ingratitude, unworthy of any civilized being. [Applause on the Republican side, and cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment was offered to the bill in 1913, when the bill was in committee. It was adopted, and it was made a part of the bill as reported from the Committee on Appropriations. When the bill came before the House it was stricken out in Committee of the Whole, and when it got before the House itself on a roll call the House agreed to the amendment.

I do not know whether it was incorporated in the bill at the next session or not as it came from the committee. Anyhow, the amendment was offered on the floor. This bill does not carry the amendment. Neither the subcommittee nor the full Committee on Appropriations placed it there, although an effort was made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] to do so, and he reserved the right to do as he has done and as he should do, holding the convictions that he does.

Now, as far as I am concerned, I agree with him about the amendment. I voted for it in the committee. I voted for it heretofore on the floor of the House on two occasions. I do not believe that anyone who was a citizen of the United States and who has adjured that allegiance and sworn allegiance to some foreign country ought to be permitted to tax the people of this country to continue the payment of the pension that he might be entitled to if he still remained a citizen of this country.

I at one time put into the Record, when this question was first up, a list of the leading countries of the world, which provided that within a certain time after a pensioner left the realm that he was a subject of and went to a foreign country he would be stricken from the roll, unless it should appear by his affidavit that he still retained his allegiance to the country which pensioned him.

Now, this amendment will in no way affect those who are temporarily residing abroad. It can affect only those who never did owe allegiance to the United States or to those who, having owed it, abandoned it and took up allegiance to some other country.

Now, it may be true, and I have no doubt it is true, that numbers of people came here from foreign countries and enlisted during the war from 1861 to 1865. It is a historic fact that many thousands of them were paid bounties and enlisted because they were paid bounties; and I to-day incorporated in the Record a list showing the amounts of bounties thus paid, aggregating something like \$285,941,036, which the States paid to those people when they enlisted and \$160,000,000 by the United States. And when they have received bounties and have received pensions up to this time, it seems to me that when men want to continue to draw pensions for which the people of this country are so highly taxed they should at least, when they go abroad, retain their allegiance to the flag of the United States and not forswear their allegiance to it.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I understand that the Commissioner of Pensions is in accord with the veteran organization known as the Grand Army of the Republic. He is a member of that organization, and a prominent member, and in close touch with the organization. I understand that the feeling in the Grand Army is that whatever pensions are paid out should be paid to soldiers who have not renounced their allegiance to the United States. They want to save this \$1,034,000 that is paid out to foreigners.

Now, this country is good enough for me to live in. I think if a man who served in the Army thinks some other country is more desirable, and he renounces his allegiance to the United States, the Government of the United States does not owe him anything.

Now, in answer to what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] says about the Canadians coming over here and fighting, it is true. But this amendment takes care of every soldier who was wounded or disabled in the service, so that it can do no injustice to any worthy soldier of the war, and I am in favor of the amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], and I hope that it will not be adopted. These gentlemen who enlisted in the military service of our country had no contract with the Government that they should remain citizens of the United States after their services terminated.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. FIELDS. Not now. I feel, Mr. Chairman, that these men who enlisted under our flag and helped to maintain our Union should now be remembered by us who enjoy the glories of the flag, and that we should not forget them, wherever they may be. I realize that the adoption of this amendment would make some saving in our appropriation, but I am one of those who believe that a time comes to all men when they should hold their patriotism above their pocketbooks. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I hope that the amendment will be defeated.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD], the chairman of the committee, referred to the fact that these pensioners have left the United States as a matter of choice. Some may have done so. Others may not. Some may have crossed the Canadian line to follow their children. Should this great Government now deprive them of the pensions they earned in supporting the Government because out of love for their own children they have followed them into a foreign country? I say it is unfair, it is unjust, it is un-American, it is unpatriotic, and I hope the amendment will be defeated. [Applause.]

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This proposition has been before the House three or four times in the past, and if my memory serves me right, after due deliberation it has always been voted down, I suppose on the theory that it would be an act of injustice to those who gave their bodies and their health when they were in the prime of life to be devoted to the service of this country.

Mr. SHERWOOD. This takes care of those who are disabled. This is another proposition.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I know that. I have personal knowledge of a number of cases of persons who live in Germany. They get \$12 a month. If they were required, under this amendment, to return to the United States, they could not live on \$12 a month, and most of them would become objects of public charity, while in the old country, surrounded perhaps by their kinsfolk and descendants, they can make both ends meet, even on \$12 a month. And I want to assure the gentlemen of this House that every one of those men is as much of a patriot now as he was at the time he fought under the flag. [Applause.] There are laws in the European countries which require a man, after he has resided there for a certain length of time—I believe it is two or three years—to make his decision either to return to the United States or to become a citizen of the other country. Now, most of those men at the expiration of that time, with the aid of friends, return to this country for a trip, for the purpose of renewing their passports, and then they go back again. But there are others who are financially unable to make that trip. They are as good Americans as we are.

Mr. BORLAND. I want to ask the gentleman one question.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. All right. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman, I suppose, is familiar with the laws of Germany on this as on other subjects. Does he understand that the German Government pays pensions to men who are not German citizens?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I do not know.

Mr. LOBECK. I can answer that. A constituent of mine, Mr. August Carstens, in my home city of Omaha, wrote me a letter a few days ago, in which he said that he served in the Franco-Prussian War and in the Schleswig-Holstein War, and that he is now drawing a pension from the German Government, and he told me the amount. The letter is written in German. I do not happen to have it with me.

Mr. BORLAND. Is he an American citizen?

Mr. LOBECK. He is an American citizen, and has been ever since 1873.

Mr. BORLAND. They do not know it.

Mr. GORDON. They probably do not know it over there.

Mr. LOBECK. Germany does know it. That is one case in which Germany pays a pension to an American citizen.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I want to refer to a statement made by my colleague from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND]. He said these men might die and we would not know anything about it, and that the pensions would continue to be paid to dead men. The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that every one of these men has to register with the American consul and the voucher has to be executed before the consul, and a man has to present himself in person, and consequently there could be no such thing as a fraud on the Government. If there is, the American consul would have to be in collusion with the pensioner, and that is almost out of the question. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely trust that this amendment, regarding it as most unjust, as I do, will not prevail.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, no man on the floor of the House during my service in Congress has been more careful and more considerate of the public Treasury than myself. But when it comes to the question of appropriating money for the necessary administration of the Government I have always cheerfully subscribed to a liberal sum. The question on the amendment now pending, it appears to me, in addition to the arguments presented by other gentlemen, is that if passed at this time it might be construed by some of the countries now engaged in war as an unfriendly act on the part of the United States.

While I do not go as far as to say that that would be done, yet I do say that to pass this amendment at this time, after having kept the law on the statute books for all these long years in the past, it might be construed by some at least as an unfriendly act on the part of this country.

To the men who gave their lives that my country might be free and that liberty might be preserved throughout the length and breadth of the land, I have a consideration which amounts to a devotion, and so long as I live I shall never be guilty of an act which will desecrate the great services of the soldiers who have made it possible for this country to be the greatest among all other nations. [Applause.] And as much as I am anxious, Mr. Chairman, for retrenchment at this time, I will not begin by starving the soldiers, their widows, orphans, and dependent mothers in order that we may have some little retrenchment. [Applause.] I would rather increase the pension of every soldier who fought to save the Union than to decrease a single one of them. [Applause.]

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOWLER. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. How is it that the gentleman so radically disagrees with the members of the Grand Army in these vociferous remarks, in which he expresses himself as in favor of the soldier?

Mr. FOWLER. I understand from the soldiers in my district that I am in accord with their wishes, but as far as the Grand Army is concerned, I have a resolution in my pocket now to offer at the first opportunity to appropriate \$20,000 out of the Treasury to help defray the expenses of their encampment in Washington during the coming summer.

Mr. Chairman, I would not, I will not vote against a measure that will bring to these soldiers, their widows or orphans, these soldiers now on the tottering side of time—I say I could not and I will not vote for a measure which may be construed as an assault upon the pensions of the soldiers of my country. [Applause.]

You pass this amendment, and it is only a question of time when other amendments will be offered, and there will be one assault after another until the pensions of the soldiers in this country will be seriously imperiled.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, old Dr. Johnson said, "Patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel," and he never uttered a truer word. We have to hear and read these buncombe speeches made by men who want to show their love for the old soldier by dipping deep into the public Treasury.

What is the question before the House? The question is as to cutting off a million dollars in pensions now paid to those who have renounced their allegiance to the United States and became citizens of foreign countries. The amendment excepts in every case those who sustained actual injury, clearly meeting the case mentioned by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLOMEW] where they lost limbs or health. They are expressly excepted under the amendment. It simply cuts off those who are drawing pensions for other reasons than disabilities incurred in the service and who have renounced their allegiance to the United States. That is the proposition, and it seems to me, as a matter of common sense, it ought to be adopted. I do not think there is a nation on the face of the earth outside of our own that pays pensions to aliens.

The gentleman speaks of fraud. Any lawyer on the floor of this House knows that fraud committed in a foreign country may be committed with impunity in behalf of these alien pensioners and our courts have no jurisdiction to prosecute them. They are beyond the seas, beyond our jurisdiction, and beyond the reach of our process; and this law, which permits pensions to be paid to aliens in foreign countries, is simply placing a premium upon fraud, and when fraud is committed there is absolutely no remedy. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the statement of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON], respecting the chances of fraud in the payment of foreign pensions, I want to say I had an experience as American consul at Glasgow, Scotland, and under the regulations every pensioner was required to come to the consulate every three months, where he or she qualified to the necessary vouchers and were identified before the American consul. After that performance was completed the vouchers were transmitted by me to the Secretary of the Interior, and the pension checks were returned by mail. So there is absolutely no chance in the world of committing fraud against the Treasury of the United States in the payment of pensions to those living abroad.

In addition to the exemption stated by the gentleman, that these pensions should continue to soldiers who were diseased or injured, it does not cover the cases of widows of soldiers who live abroad, and I know of one or two instances in the city of Glasgow where we are paying pensions to the widows of Union soldiers. I hope the Members of this House will let these old defenders of the Union and their widows die in peace. [Applause.] They have only a few months or years to live. They are 70 and 75 years of age, beyond the seas in foreign lands, and we now propose to strike them down, to bring hardship and unhappiness to the hearts of every one of them who were willing to risk their lives to preserve the Union. The American Congress is now called upon to forget justice, to forget humanity, and to forget the services of these men in the time of the country's peril. No man in this House should vote for this unjust amendment.

Mr. GOOD rose.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. GOOD. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to fix on some time when debate shall close on this paragraph and amendments thereto.

Mr. GOOD. I want only five minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, my understanding is that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS] has a substitute which he desires to offer to the amendment.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, I do not like this amendment very much, and I prepared an amendment to offer as a substitute in its place, but I do not believe I like that very much. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] has changed his mind. I do not believe that this is a good time to cut these people off.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the opportunity of offering at least a pro forma amendment in order to make reply to some remarks which were made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] in charge of the bill in general debate when I was not present.

Mr. MANN. There is another paragraph.

Mr. PALMER. Very well.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, this same proposition has been before the House every year during the past four years when we considered the pension appropriation bill. A few years ago I put into the RECORD the letter of Mr. Lochren, who was Commissioner of Pensions during the second administration of President Cleveland. Judge Lochren wrote in his annual report the following:

A clause of chapter 187 of the public acts of the second session of the Fifty-second Congress provides:

"That from and after July 1, 1893, no pension shall be paid to a nonresident, who is not a citizen of the United States, except for actual disabilities incurred in the service."

I respectfully ask your attention to this clause, in the hope that you may recommend its repeal. It causes great trouble and annoyance to the excepted classes, who constitute the great bulk of nonresident pensioners, in compelling them to make proof that they belong to these excepted classes. And the final result is that payments under it are withheld from but few, save widows and dependent mothers, who have little else for their maintenance. The saving is too little to offset the suffering inflicted in individual cases. If all nonresidents were refused payment of pension some plausible argument might be made in support of such policy; but none can be urged in favor of this law, which, while giving annoyance to all, strikes only the most helpless.

I should not feel warranted in asking attention to this law but for the fact that it entails much work on this bureau, in answering communications, and seems to yield little practical results except annoyance and apparent cruelty. I recognize to the fullest extent that my sole duty is to execute and administer the laws as they are enacted—fairly and honestly interpreted.

Very respectfully,

WM. LOCHREN,
Commissioner.

The SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. GOOD. No; I can not yield. That was the opinion of Judge Lochren, the Democratic Commissioner of Pensions under President Cleveland. What he says expresses my views, and I believe it expresses the views of the people of the United States.

The report on this shows that of those nonresidents who receive pension, 504 reside in Germany, and almost 500 of them in Ireland, and more than 400 in England. Does anyone suppose that any considerable number of those ever were citizens of the United States and have renounced their citizenships? Certainly not. According to the report of Judge Lochren a large majority of them must be the widows of soldiers who gave their services to the United States, and those widows are now receiving a small pension of \$12 a month. By this amendment you propose to take it away from them. When their husbands enlisted in the cause of the Union we did not object to them because they came from Germany, or Ireland, or England, or Canada. We accepted their services, and when we enacted a pension law we called it a service pension. We gave a pension in accordance with the service which was rendered by the soldier, and now we are going to say, no matter how distinguished the service, if a person who rendered that service, or if his widow, lives in a foreign land, he or she shall not receive a penny of this service pension. I am opposed to the amendment. It has been defeated every time it has been offered; it ought to be defeated now. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For fees and expenses of examining surgeons, pensions, for services rendered within the fiscal year 1916, \$100,000.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, when the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] closed the general debate upon the bill I was not upon the floor, coming in just as he was uttering perhaps the last sentence. I was told afterwards that he had indulged in some remarks about the child-labor bill which passed this House day before yesterday and about myself, and cast some animadversions upon the great State which I in part represent upon this floor. Since then I have examined the reporters' notes of the gentleman's speech, and I find that the gentleman took it upon himself to defend the Constitution against the violent assault which was being made upon it by this child-labor bill and to defend the imperial Commonwealth of Georgia against the aspersions of a mere Pennsylvanian. I have the highest regard and respect for my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia. I have always considered him an able lawyer, a wise man, and a sincere man. I can not help but believe that he is too wise a man and has been too keen an observer of current events to hold me in any wise responsible for conditions in Pennsylvania. I grant that conditions with respect to labor in Pennsylvania are not what they ought to be, especially with respect to the conditions under which women and children are permitted to labor in that great industrial State. These conditions are caused by the fact, admitted now by all men, that that State is controlled in its governmental operations under a partnership agreement which has long been in force between the great protected interests of my State and the Republican machine; and I am quite sure that my friend, the gentleman from Georgia, will not suspect that I have any sympathy with either end of that partnership.

Mr. BARTLETT. I do not.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I can not yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. I did not mean to interrupt the gentleman without his permission, but I interrupted the gentleman to say I did not think he had anything to do with it.

Mr. PALMER. Well, the gentleman's declaration was it was my duty to remove the beam in the Pennsylvania eye before I undertook to extract the mote in the eye of the State of Georgia.

Mr. BARTLETT. That was a mere figure of speech.

Mr. PALMER. I have made some effort to remove the beam, and the gentleman must know that I have myself expended some effort and energy—

Mr. MANN. And money.

Mr. PALMER (continuing). At the cost of a seat in this House in order to better conditions in that great State. But I am against the exploitation of child labor—

Mr. BARTLETT. So am I.

Mr. PALMER. I am against the labor of women and children under improper conditions in my State and in my district just as much as I am against it in the State of Georgia. [Applause.] I have fought in Pennsylvania ever since I have been in public and political life to better the conditions under which men as well as women and children shall work, and my own district is one of the districts where conditions have not been what I would like to have them, and where I have made some fight to better them, as some of the gentlemen here present know. I regret that better progress is not being made in Pennsylvania; I regret that in regard to child labor it is one of the dark spots in the country, just as I regret Georgia is a dark spot; and I regret to say that despite the beautiful promises made in our State by the party candidates who were successful in the late campaign, word comes to-day from Harrisburg that the new governor of the Commonwealth has issued a declaration stating that though he is just as much for a proper child-labor law now as he was before election, still he thinks that business conditions in the State are such as to make it necessary to postpone consideration of that legislation until the session of the legislature two years hence.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, may I have five minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE. Reserving the right to object, since the gentleman is making an attack upon his own State, I desire to

respond. I agree to the gentleman continuing as long as he pleases, if we may have an equal amount of time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] will proceed.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I expect to have some time.

Mr. PALMER. I shall certainly not object.

I am making no attack, Mr. Chairman, upon Pennsylvania. I have heard that kind of talk until I am tired of it. I am a Pennsylvanian, like my friend, the gentleman who represents a great Philadelphia district. I love my State. My people came there when William Penn nosed the good ship *Welcome* up the Delaware in 1682, and with his Quaker colonists founded his great experiment in the woods, and they have lived there ever since. And I hope I shall be buried beneath her beautiful hills. I love my State, but I would not believe that I could love her if I should stand silent when I see her despoiled by the machine that dominates that Commonwealth. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Pennsylvania is one of the States where we have not protected the little children, and, with all due respect to the gentleman from Georgia, so is Georgia. He says he was the author—

Mr. BARTLETT. I did not say that I was the author—

Mr. PALMER. Well, that he had actively worked, perhaps, for child-labor legislation in Georgia; and yet I find that of 40 States in the Union which prohibit child labor under 14 years in mills and factories, Georgia is not one.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I say to the gentleman that is not correct? We have an act which prohibits it now, with children under 14 years.

Mr. PALMER. When was it passed?

Mr. BARTLETT. In 1908.

Mr. PALMER. I will say to the gentleman that what I am reading from—

Mr. BARTLETT. I have seen that publication, and I have taken occasion to put in the *Record* on two different times the statute of the State of Georgia, which shows what the law is.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield on that subject?

Mr. PALMER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will look at the debate two years ago on this matter he will find that the statement is correct.

Mr. PALMER. I was about to say that while I have not examined this myself, this compilation was made by the agents of the child labor committee, who have gone over the matter with great care and in whose accuracy I have great confidence. Of 16 States which forbid child labor in mines and quarries, Georgia is not one. Of 16 States which forbid children working more than eight hours a day in mills and factories, Georgia is not one. Amongst 33 States which forbid any work by children under 16 years of age in mills and factories, Georgia is not one. And it does seem to me, therefore, that I was perfectly justified in the statement that the employing interests of Georgia are opposed to this bill, just exactly as they are opposed to the bill in Pennsylvania, where a strong and bitter fight has been made by the textile mill owners, as has been made by the cotton mills in Georgia, against any law which would forbid night work of children under 16 or work for more than 8 hours a day or more than 48 hours in the week.

Now, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] went on to impeach my Democracy, I assume because of the position I have taken in support of this bill, which to his mind is violently against the Constitution and against every principle of the party to which we both adhere. Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not profess to be a great constitutional lawyer like my friend from Georgia. Before I came to Congress I was engaged for 15 or 16 years in the active practice of the law, being almost constantly busy in the trial of cases, many of them involving constitutional questions; and I have always been too busy trying cases and practicing law to indulge in the practice, which I find to be so common in Washington, of publicly expressing my views about the Constitution when the Constitution is not in issue [applause] and, because I approve of my own remarks, considering myself a great constitutional lawyer. [Applause.] The trouble with the gentleman from Georgia is that he comes from a school of lawyers who interpret the Constitution according to their own preconceived notion of what the Constitution ought to mean instead of according to what the Supreme Court says it does mean. They find the Constitution bounded by four corners which they set up in their own mind, and refuse to allow to the supreme judicial authority in the land the privilege of erecting the corners which shall mark the boundaries of that instrument. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PALMER. I have no manner of doubt that this proposed Federal child-labor bill is entirely constitutional. I get it not from some idea that I may have of what I think the Constitution ought to mean but what the Supreme Court has said time and again the Constitution does mean. Under the power to regulate interstate commerce I have no doubt that the Supreme Court will hold, when this law gets to it, as it will some day, I presume, that the Congress has full power to prohibit from interstate commerce any articles which are produced under conditions which inside of a State call for the exercise of the police power of a State.

The Supreme Court held that we may prohibit the transportation of so innocent a thing as a piece of pasteboard, representing a lottery ticket, because the use to which that lottery ticket may be put in the future is against the public morals. It has been held that we may prohibit from interstate commerce articles which endanger the agents and carriers in transportation, such as explosives and loose hay.

My mind is clear that if we can enact a law which the Supreme Court upholds, prohibiting the transportation in interstate commerce of articles which, though innocent in themselves, yet, because of the use to which they will be put, may be prohibited as being against the morals of the Nation, so we may by law prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of articles which have been produced in such a way as to operate against the morals of the Nation. If we may prohibit the transmission of articles in interstate commerce because of the final use to which those articles or products are put, we may follow them back to the system under which they were produced.

I shall not argue the constitutional question, but I do not believe that real constitutional lawyers who will discuss it and argue it in the light of the opinions of the Supreme Court, without being prejudiced by their own individual opinions upon its political and economic phases, will ever fail to hold that this law is entirely constitutional. [Applause.]

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to undertake at this late hour to say anything much in reply to what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] has said. I want to say, however, that I did not know at the time that the gentleman was not in the House. I was informed that he was. I would have said what I did say had he been present, and he knows that, I am sure.

I do not arrogate to myself any great knowledge of constitutional law, Mr. Chairman, nor believe or consider myself or pretend to be any great constitutional lawyer, but I do believe, and, so far as I can judge from what the Supreme Court has decided in other cases, I am confident they will hold the bill he refers to to be unconstitutional, if it ever becomes a law. And believing that, in construing the Constitution of the United States, it is my duty when I come to vote upon a question that I believe is contrary to that instrument to vote against it.

Now, the Supreme Court of the United States in the lottery case did not decide that Congress had the right to prohibit the transmission of any legitimate article of commerce through the channels of interstate commerce. They distinctly decided in that case that they would not decide that such was the law. Great lawyers, among them one who has been Attorney General of the United States from the State of Pennsylvania, have in another body rendered reports from the Committee on the Judiciary in which they have questioned the constitutionality of laws like this.

I have no apologies, Mr. Chairman, to make for the assertion that I believe in the Constitution of the United States. I believe we should preserve it, Mr. Chairman, because only by preserving it can we maintain and perpetuate this Government. And I can not do better than to call attention to what was said by the great orator, Edmund Burke, upon an occasion when he was urged to agree to a certain bill for reform in the British Parliament, when he refused to advocate certain measures which, in his opinion, violated the constitution of Great Britain, though unwritten. He said on that occasion, "We should bear in mind that we have a Government to preserve as well as a Government to reform." And I am unwilling to give my adherence to the proposition that the Congress of the United States can do what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] says it can do, namely, exercise the power given

under the commerce clause for the purpose of regulating or executing the police laws of the States.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes.

Mr. PALMER. Do not do me the injustice to say that I said anything of that sort.

Mr. BARTLETT. I so understood you.

Mr. PALMER. No. What I say is that the Congress has the right to prohibit from interstate commerce any product which was manufactured and produced under conditions which call for the exercise of the police power in the State where it was produced.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is virtually the same.

Mr. PALMER. Oh, no.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes; it is. I beg the gentleman's pardon; that is the same—that if the State, in the exercise of its police power, has imposed upon it the duty of correcting certain evils that exist in it and fails to exercise that power, then it becomes the duty of the United States Congress to exercise the power of the interstate-commerce clause of the United States Constitution to regulate those things. Now, I do not profess to be a great lawyer, but I do not suppose that anybody who professes to be a great lawyer or to be a lawyer at all would make any such claim as that.

Mr. Chairman, in all seriousness, I did not mean any reflection upon the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I do not doubt that he has used every effort, as he has stated, in his State to correct these evils. I would not have said anything about the gentleman or his bill if he had not challenged the votes of those who had voted against the bill in his speech in reply to my colleague [Mr. TRIBBLE]. I would have contented myself with simply voting my conviction. But I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that I do not believe Congress has the right to exercise the power of the commerce clause of the Constitution to prohibit the transmission through the channels of commerce perfectly legitimate articles of commerce.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I want just five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I believe that we should preserve the Constitution of the United States. I believe it is the great charter of our liberties, and that if we attempt, because the States do not exercise their reserve rights, to assume on the part of the United States Congress the power to pass police laws, then there is nothing left to it.

Mr. Chairman, the English people have a great constitution, which they call the Magna Charta, the chart of English liberty. I will conclude by quoting Stimson on the Constitution:

It is a sad contrast between the way that so many of our people or our newspapers feel to-day, 120 years after the adoption of our Magna Charta, and the way the people felt in England, exactly the same time, 120 years, after the adoption of their own. For in 1253, 138 years after John's charter, in the thirty-seventh year of the reign of Henry III, a popular King, a great jurist, and a radical maker of new laws: "On the 3d day of May [I read from the statutes of the realm in Latin], in the great hall of the King of Westminster, in the presence of the King and his brother and the marshal of England and the other estates of the realm, we, Boniface, Archbishop of Canterbury, and the bishops of London, and Ely and Rochester, and Worcester, and Lincoln, and Norwich and Carlyle, and St. David's, all appareled in pontificals, with tapers burning, against the breakers of the liberties or customs of the realm of England, and, namely, those which are contained in the charter of the common liberties of England, excommunicate, accurse, and from the benefits of our holy mother the church sequester all those who by any craft or willness do violate, break, diminish, or change the statutes and free customs of the realm of England, to the perpetual memory of which excommunication we, the aforesaid prelates, have put our seals."

So in 1253 they felt in England when they called attention to the great charter of English liberties, and so in 1910, to-day, when we love that great charter of English liberties and swear to observe the greater charter of American liberties, to-day we feel that the curses of those who love liberty should be visited upon those who violate it.

Mr. Chairman, these great lovers of English liberty and of the Magna Charta, for more than 120 years after it had been adopted, were accustomed to gather for the purpose of perpetuating that great charter and pronouncing condemnations against those who would violate it. Now, nearly 130 years after our great instrument was adopted, when we have lived under it and perpetuated our Government under it, I have no love for those who would destroy it by the means that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] undertakes to destroy it. I have no apologies to make to him or to any one else of these reform-

ers who would destroy our Government in order to reform it. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am glad this discussion between my friends from Georgia and Pennsylvania [Mr. BARTLETT and Mr. PALMER] was confined, in large part, to constitutional lines, because I want to avoid that sort of a discussion. My regret is that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER], who was sent for to come to the defense of his State in consequence of the attack of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT], has seen fit to attack Pennsylvania rather than to defend it. My friend [Mr. PALMER] is a colleague for whom I have great respect. I especially respected him in the last campaign when he had the courage to accept a nomination for Senator from Pennsylvania in order to test out those views he entertained with regard to the spoliation of the State by the party in power. Everything he has said to-day about the State being despoiled he said with tenfold vehemence from every stump in every town he could reach with his own resources and those that were contributed to his campaign by wealthy patrons of the Democratic Party. But the people of the State did not accept the arguments and charges of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] at the valuation he has given them in his argument to-day.

The people of Pennsylvania heard all of this talk about the State being despoiled. There are 8,000,000 of them over there, and they are pretty sensible. About 1,000,000 of them voted. But when the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER], who has not defended his State as I hoped he would to-day, came amongst the people of the State to tell them of the wrongs that had been inflicted upon them, he failed to tell them anything about the low tariff he had helped to inflict upon them.

The people of Pennsylvania knew the industrial record of the State for more than 100 years. They understood, for they had enjoyed the progress and prosperity that had resulted from a protective-tariff system; they knew it to be a mill-building rather than a mill-destroying system; a labor-employing, rather than a labor-despoiling system, and they were not especially enamored of the things my colleague undertook to say to them. They knew that in the matter of educating our children we spend more money in Pennsylvania for the public-school system, perhaps, than is spent in any other State of this Union, with the possible exception of one. They knew that 1,000,000 children were going to school in Pennsylvania, and that we had even a compulsory education law, of which my colleague [Mr. FARR] was the author when he was in the Pennsylvania Legislature. They knew we had a law regulating the employment of child labor. We have a law which prevents them from laboring under 14 years of age, and, with certain conditions, under 16 years of age. The people said, "We do not agree with you, Mr. PALMER, that this State, which has been builded up under a protective-tariff system until it is the most prosperous industrial community in the world, and until it has acquired the largest individual farming community in the country—we do not agree with you, Mr. PALMER, of Pennsylvania, when you say that this State, which under the old system has grown rich, which under the old system has kept all its people employed, which under this system has put itself absolutely out of debt—we do not agree with you, Mr. PALMER, that this great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has been despoiled." [Applause.]

But the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] persisted. He continued to tell his story from one end of the State to the other, and people who were ambitious for power, or who were fond of getting their pictures in the newspapers as belonging to the uplift, contributed largely to his campaign. The newspapers published his terrible tales of spoliation and revealed in the destruction of his opponent, but the people, the voters of the Commonwealth, knew what the gentleman stood for, and on election day they marched up to the polls and by a majority of more than 250,000 they buried Mr. PALMER and told him his charges were not true.

Mr. PALMER rose.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman want to ask me a question?

Mr. PALMER. I want to try to get a little time after the gentleman has concluded.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman says he can not remain silent while his State is being despoiled. The gentleman has told the people of his Commonwealth all this, but he has not been supported by those to whom he made his appeal. He should not find fault with them now.

Mr. DONOHUE. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. MOORE. Yes; I yield to my colleague from an important industrial district of Philadelphia, and I suggest that before he

asks me a question he answer one from me, as to whether there is not a great lack of employment in his district just now?

Mr. DONOHUE. I had rather answer it by propounding my own question first.

Mr. MOORE. Well, I would like to ask the gentleman an Irish question—

Mr. DONOHUE. On that I am at home.

Mr. MOORE (continuing). Whether it is true that in his district there is a tremendous number of the unemployed just now, due to a Democratic tariff law, of which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] was partly the author?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONOHUE. I will answer the gentleman by saying that there is a tremendous demand for a better child-labor law in our State.

Mr. MOORE. That may be. There is also a desire for it because a number of the ladies who do not have any children and who do not understand that the widowed mothers whose children must have some support are anxious to keep this uplift publicity game going. I have seen the children of the poor, who were supporting widowed mothers in wretched apartments, turned out of their employment and made to walk the streets because of the restrictions imposed by some of these laws.

But what I wanted to know of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER], who speaks of the despoiling of his State, whether there has been anything under heaven that has so tended to despoil our State, that was more prosperous than any other in the country, than the Underwood tariff bill, the steel schedule of which was written by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER], who now prates about the spoliation of his State?

Go into the mill districts represented in part by the gentleman who has just interrogated me [Mr. DONOHUE] and look at the long lines of unemployed to-day, who were actively and busily employed before the gentleman who speaks of the spoliation of his State got in his deadly free-trade work.

Go into my own district where the people got good wages two and a half years ago, happy men, women, and children, and where there was no great necessity for passing restrictive laws and see them to-day wending their toilsome, weary way to the soup houses to obtain the sustenance of life.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman from Missouri arises. He knows that there is a large number of unemployed in Kansas City. A newspaper clipping handed to me day before yesterday states that in Kansas City there are 5,000 men seeking an opportunity for employment. These are days of Democratic spoliation.

Mr. BORLAND. Whoever said that did not know what he was talking about, for it is not the fact.

Mr. MOORE. When we had the protective system, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania knows—

Mr. BORLAND. What was the condition in the gentleman's district in 1907?

Mr. MOORE. In 1907 we were doing as well as could be expected. [Cries of "Oh!" "Oh!" and laughter on the Democratic side.] The gentleman knows that in 1907 there was no tariff panic. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], just as all Democrats do, seeks to evade, when the tariff question is reached, by pointing to the financial panic of 1907 as an excuse for the wickedness of the existing tariff law, which actually took labor away from the people of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. FOWLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I can not yield, much as I like my friend from Illinois. He made a beautiful soldier speech to-day, but I have got to finish this. Only the other day the gentleman from Pennsylvania who speaks about the spoliation of his State voted to still further decrease the opportunities for labor in his State. He voted to take away from the shipyards of the Delaware River, where we build more ships and give more employment in this calling than elsewhere—he voted to take away the wages of men who are laboring there in order that the Government might take their money to build ships in foreign shipyards. The gentleman voted for the passage of that ship bill, which would take the bread and butter from the mouths of the workmen in his own district, where at the Bethlehem Steel Works they are now employed. When he voted to transfer American work and wages to foreign shipyards he contributed still further

to that work of spoliation in Pennsylvania so unhappily begun when he assisted in putting the Democratic free-trade tariff law into effect. Spoliation of the State is not the brick the gentleman ought to throw.

Mr. PALMER rose.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentleman would yield to me just a moment or two. I want to say to the Republican side of the House that I have asked the chairman of the Republican conference to call a conference of Republicans to-morrow afternoon to be held in the Hall of the House immediately after the adjournment of the House, in reference to a matter which the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] communicated to me to-day; and I want to say that if there are any Members elect in the next House who are here, we want them to attend the conference as well.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, the remarks of my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Philadelphia [Mr. MOORE], are only another illustration of what I said awhile ago was the cause of the evils from which we suffer in Pennsylvania, and that is the fact that the government there is controlled by a combination between the most corrupt political organization in America and the most avaricious and greedy set of manufacturers on earth. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is perfectly natural, in view of the fact that the attack which we made upon this hog combine in Pennsylvania in 1914, and which resulted in a majority by 28,000 of the people of Pennsylvania repudiating its foremost friend and exponent, that when we go after the hog combine, it should squeal; and I have always observed that the smaller the pig the louder the squeal. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] The gentleman says that what we argued for in Pennsylvania in 1914 was repudiated. Not at all. Nearly 30,000 more men voted against what the gentleman stands for in Pennsylvania this year than voted for it, and only because of the unfortunate circumstance that the enemies of this corrupt combine could not be joined upon single candidates is the gentleman permitted to boast that Pennsylvania to-day can have in the United States Senate a member of his own political party.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. Yes; I yield to my friend.

Mr. BUTLER. I am obliged to the gentleman, but I did not quite understand him. Was there not a unity upon the candidate for governor?

Mr. PALMER. The gentleman is a gentleman of keen understanding, and he knows perfectly well what I meant when I said that the chief of the Republican organization in Pennsylvania was repudiated in 1914 by a big majority of the voters of Pennsylvania. He knows. When the gentleman says that it was the Underwood tariff law, for which I am partly responsible, that brought about that result in Pennsylvania, he knows that he is not speaking according to the facts. I make no apology for the Underwood tariff law, and in my district, the greatest industrial district in Pennsylvania and one of the greatest in the Nation, I have defended it upon every stump, and the voters have supported it by a big majority; and that great district, with one of the biggest steel and iron mills in America, will be represented in the next Congress, as in this, by a Jeffersonian Democrat who believes in the Underwood tariff law. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I will tell the gentleman—no, not him, because he knows—but I will tell other gentlemen what caused the result in Pennsylvania. It was not the tariff that beat the Democratic Party, it was rum—r-u-m—for the organized liquor traffic of Pennsylvania, operating alongside of the vicious interests which the gentleman from Pennsylvania always supports, threw into that campaign the largest campaign fund ever known in a State campaign in the history of our country, and it took, as the gentleman knows, more than a million dollars to seat a Republican Senator in the United States Senate. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Why, the gentleman's party organization in Philadelphia and in the State has filed accounts in which they admit—admit—having spent \$750,000 for that purpose, and my experience with the Republican machine is that what they do not admit is at least twice what they do confess. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. For a question.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman state how much was expended by the Democratic campaign committee in Pennsylvania in the last senatorial fight?

Mr. PALMER. Certainly. There was expended in the senatorial fight, and the fight for the State ticket included, approximately \$75,000. Why, the gentleman knows that the Republican State committee in Pennsylvania when it filed its account admitted unpaid obligations exceeding in amount all that the Democratic Party expended in the State.

Mr. MOORE. That is evidence of honesty in expenditure—that we owed \$90,000.

Mr. PALMER. I am waiting to see whether you pay it.

Mr. MOORE. I would like to ask the gentleman, since he has been personal, whether he would indicate how much money was spent in all by the gentleman who ran for governor of Pennsylvania on the Democratic ticket—

Mr. PALMER. Oh, well—

Mr. MOORE. He was a rich man.

Mr. PALMER. I do not remember, but I believe he accounted for \$33,000, or something of that kind. I can not yield further.

Mr. MOORE. But the gentleman—

Mr. PALMER. It is so infinitesimally small in comparison with what the Republicans have spent it is hardly worth the time to consider it.

Mr. MOORE. Why does not the gentleman be fair and tell us what was spent on his side?

Mr. PALMER. I have said.

Mr. MOORE. What the gentleman and his colleague, who ran for governor—

Mr. PALMER. I have answered the gentleman's question.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman has not; the matter has been concealed.

Mr. PALMER. Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania defends the action of the Republican legislature in our State in refusing to pass laws to protect little children upon the same old plea, the same old ground, that without those laws Pennsylvania has prospered and become rich and great. He says that our great textile industries, all of our industries have grown wealthy, and that is true. I know men who have woolen mills in our State who say they can consign them to the scrap heap and still show a great profit under Republican tariff laws. I do not deny that wealth has been produced, I do not deny that men have grown rich, but I do declare, as a Pennsylvanian, that the greed of these men, ever seeking additional wealth, ought not to be strong enough to grind down into the mire the little boys and girls, the mothers and fathers of to-morrow's generation. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who knows as well as any man in our State the true Quaker spirit of that great old Commonwealth, when pushed into a corner, now defends the interests that he and his colleagues represent upon this floor, still when the question was presented day before yesterday, out of fear of the righteous wrath of the mothers of Philadelphia, he ran away and would not vote against this child-labor bill. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I have no patience with the gyrations of a gentleman who tries to play both sides against the middle in that fashion.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman want me to tell him—

Mr. PALMER. He runs away from the wrath of the mothers and fathers of Pennsylvania, and at the same time defends the protected interests of our State. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, one word in reference to the Georgia statute, which I have sent for and received. The gentleman from Georgia says it was a liberal statute protecting children, and I notice it provides that no child under 10 years of age shall be employed. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BARTLETT. But the gentleman has not read it all.

Mr. PALMER (reading)—

No child under 10 years of age shall be employed or allowed to labor in or about a factory or manufacturing establishment within this State under any circumstances.

Under certain conditions a child under 12 years of age shall not be employed, and in reference to children under 14 years of age it says:

On and after January 1, 1908, no child, except as heretofore provided, shall be employed or allowed to labor in or about any factory or manufacturing establishment within this State between the hours of 7 p. m. and 6 a. m.

I admit, though I do not pretend to be the lawyer my distinguished colleague from Georgia is, that under that law children under the age of 14 can work between 6 a. m. and 7 p. m., and I congratulate the gentleman in having a State in the same class with our own beloved Pennsylvania. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the gentleman read the next section?

Mr. PALMER. I read it.

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman has not read the next section.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to interfere with the discussion of the gentlemen that is not pertinent to this bill, but the hour is growing late, and it is desired, if possible, to start on another appropriation bill to-night.

Mr. MANN. Ask unanimous consent that all debate on this bill close in five minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all further debate on this paragraph close in five minutes, with the understanding that we will go on and pass the pension bill then.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all debate on this bill close in five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, it surprises me that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] is willing to compare the child-labor laws of Pennsylvania with those of Georgia. In Pennsylvania a child under 14 years of age shall not work—

Mr. TRIBBLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR. I have only five minutes. If you could accord me a little more time—

Mr. TRIBBLE. I wanted to ask one question.

Mr. FARR. Unless that child can read and write he shall not work until he is 16. I want to say that no State of the Union has better factory laws, better child-labor laws than the State of Pennsylvania, and I defy the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] to disprove that statement. But my point is this—

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. FARR. I have only five minutes.

Mr. PALMER. The gentleman defies me.

Mr. FARR. If you will see that I get five minutes more I will yield. But the manifest unfairness of such a comparison does not any more astonish me than the gentleman's hypocrisy on the floor of this House—

Mr. TRIBBLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR (continuing). Any more than his demagoguery on the floor of this House. The protected State of Pennsylvania, the men and women who are deprived of work, defeated the gentleman. So far as association with the corporations and the manufacturers of Pennsylvania is concerned, no man stands closer than the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER]. He admitted on the floor of this House at the time that he was preaching this demagogism that he was the paid employee of the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western, of Scranton, and I say that he was a paid legal lobbyist in Harrisburg, fighting splendid measures in the interest of human welfare.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR. Yes; if I can get more time to finish my statement.

Mr. PALMER. I shall not take much time.

Mr. FARR. Now, what I attack is the hypocrisy—

Mr. PALMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR. I do not like to be discourteous. I have made certain statements, and I shall yield to the gentleman. I think the House will be fair to me and accord to me any reasonable time I want.

Mr. PALMER. I simply ask the gentleman to yield for the purpose of permitting me to say that when the gentleman declares I, anywhere or at any time, made the statement that I was a paid lobbyist of any railroad corporation—

Mr. FARR. I did not say any such thing.

Mr. PALMER. That is exactly what the gentleman said. If the gentleman makes the statement—

Mr. FARR. I object.

Mr. PALMER. If he says that, it is absolutely false—and he knows it.

Mr. FARR. I say to the gentleman that I charge him now, as I charged him before, with being a lawyer in the employ of the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad, and also as a paid legal lobbyist in Harrisburg, fighting measures in the interest of the children and the women and for the highest human welfare of our people.

Mr. PALMER. And I say it is absolutely false.

Mr. FARR. It is true. No other State in the Union—and I challenge the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who is befouling his own nest, to point to another State—compares in real, substantial progress in the interest of the people with Pennsylvania. It was the first to take up this great question of tuberculosis. It spent more money than all the other States combined in the investigation of the causes that led to that dread disease.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I would like to ask the gentleman to yield for a minute. I just want to correct the statement he has made. Massachusetts was the first State in the Union to take up the

question of fighting tuberculosis. The old Bay State led the way in waging war against the dread white plague, and I am particularly proud to have had a prominent part in that kind of a campaign.

Mr. FARR. Massachusetts does not compare with Pennsylvania in that respect.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Not in rotten politics, thank God!

Mr. FARR. Now, the reason the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] advances for his defeat in Pennsylvania is rum. The gentleman went all over the State of Pennsylvania talking against rum, and he came down here and voted for rum. The gentleman went all over the State with Mr. McCormick, his colleague on the ticket for governor, the former mayor of Harrisburg, talking about the toiling men and women and those who have suffered terribly as the result of the oppressiveness of corporations and manufacturers. Mr. McCormick when mayor of Harrisburg vetoed an ordinance presented to him, asking him to advance the price of labor from \$1.35 to \$1.50 a day when that city was spending vast sums for beautification.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I ask for two minutes more.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague may have five minutes more, because the other gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] has taken that much of his time.

Mr. HULINGS. Oh, we have already had too much of this "bunk."

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] may have five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] may proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. HULINGS. I object.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

Mr. MANN. You can not do that in committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is unable to do that in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I object.

Mr. PALMER (continuing). To answer the charges made against me by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR].

Mr. MANN. Oh, the gentleman has made more charges than all the other Members of the House combined, and he does not want anybody to reply to them.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] moves that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CLINE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having under consideration the bill (H. R. 21161) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. Let us get through with this bill first. The gentleman has the right to rise to a question of personal privilege.

Mr. MANN. If that is the case, before we pass this bill I will raise the point that there is no quorum present.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman should allow me five minutes in view of the kind of talk that has been had on the floor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] desires to state a question of personal privilege.

Mr. MANN. Very well. I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] makes the point that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request for the present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania withdraws his request.

Mr. MANN. I will withdraw my point of no quorum, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I renew the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARRETT] makes the point that there is no quorum present. There were only 115 Members present when the Chair counted, and 2 more make 117. That is not a quorum. There is no quorum present.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas rise?

Mr. GARRETT of Texas. For no purpose at all. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Georgia, that a call of the House be ordered.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I call for a division.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia calls for a division.

The House divided; and there were—yeas 67, yeas 43.

So a call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 82.]

Alken	Gittins	Linthicum	Sabath
Alexander	Glass	Loft	Scott
Anthony	Goldfogle	Logue	Seldomridge
Avis	Gorman	McClellan	Sells
Baker	Graham, Pa.	McGuire, Okla.	Sherley
Barchfeld	Green, Iowa	McKenzie	Sims
Barnhart	Greene, Vt.	MacDonald	Sisson
Beall, Tex.	Gregg	Mahan	Slayden
Bell, Cal.	Griest	Maher	Slemp
Bowdle	Guernsey	Manahan	Small
Britten	Hamill	Metz	Smith, Idaho
Broussard	Hamilton, N. Y.	Miller	Smith, Md.
Brown, N. Y.	Hamlin	Mondell	Smith, Minn.
Brown, W. Va.	Haugen	Montague	Smith, Saml. W.
Browne, Wis.	Hay	Moon	Sparkman
Bruckner	Helgesen	Morgan, La.	Stanley
Burgess	Helm	Morin	Stedman
Burke, Pa.	Henry	Morrison	Steenerson
Calder	Hensley	Moss, Ind.	Stephens, Tex.
Cantor	Hinds	Moss, W. Va.	Stevens, Minn.
Cantrill	Hinebaugh	Mott	Stevens, N. H.
Carr	Hobson	Mulkey	Stout
Cary	Howard	Murdock	Stringer
Chandler, N. Y.	Howell	Nelson	Talbot, Md.
Church	Hoxworth	Nolan, J. I.	Taylor, Ala.
Clark, Fla.	Hughes, W. Va.	O'Brien	Taylor, Colo.
Claypool	Hull	Oglesby	Taylor, N. Y.
Coady	Humphrey, Wash.	O'Hair	Ten Eyck
Copley	Igoe	O'Shaunessy	Thomson, Ill.
Cox	Johnson, Ky.	Padgett	Towner
Cramton	Johnson, S. C.	Page, N. C.	Townsend
Crosser	Johnson, Utah	Paige, Mass.	Treadway
Dale	Johnson, Wash.	Parker, N. Y.	Tuttle
Danforth	Jones	Patten, N. Y.	Underhill
Davis	Kahn	Patton, Pa.	Vare
Decker	Kelley, Mich.	Peters	Vollmer
Deltrick	Kent	Peterson	Volstead
Dooling	Key, Ohio	Plumley	Walker
Driscoll	Kiess, Pa.	Porter	Wallin
Dunn	Korbly	Post	Weaver
Edmonds	Kreider	Pou	Webb
Elder	Lafferty	Powers	Whaley
Estopinal	Langham	Price	Whitacre
Evans	Langley	Prouty	White
Fairchild	Lazaro	Raker	Wilson, Fla.
Faison	Lee, Ga.	Rauch	Wilson, N. Y.
Fergusson	L'Engle	Rayburn	Wingo
Finley	Lenroot	Reed	Winslow
FitzHenry	Lever	Riordan	Witherspoon
Fowler	Levy	Roberts, Mass.	Woodruff
Gardner	Lewis, Md.	Roberts, Nev.	Woods
George	Lewis, Pa.	Rothermel	Young, N. Dak.
Gerry	Lindquist	Rucker	

During the calling of the roll Mr. DIFENDERFER occupied the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

The SPEAKER. Two hundred and thirteen Members, a quorum, have answered to their names.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will unlock the doors. When the point of no quorum was made the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] had moved the previous question on the bill to its passage. That is the pending question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment to the bill.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill. The question was taken.

The SPEAKER. The yeas appear to have it; the yeas have it, and the bill is passed.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is a little late.

Mr. BARTLETT. I have moved to reconsider.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is a little late, but the Chair wants to be on the safe side. The gentleman from Texas demands the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were refused, three Members, not a sufficient number, rising in support of the demand.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. SMITH of New York. I make the point of order that that motion is dilatory.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it is. It is only a minute since the roll call disclosed a quorum.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

Mr. MANN. But the gentleman from Texas has made the point of no quorum on the passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that, but the Chair thinks there is a quorum here, because the roll call has just disclosed one.

Mr. MANN. Well, the rules require the Chair to count, especially on the passage of a bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wants to be on the safe side, and will count.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman withhold his point a moment, to enable me to report an appropriation bill?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman can not withhold it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. He can withdraw it.

The SPEAKER. He can withdraw it at any time before the count is made.

Mr. MANN. He can withdraw it, but he can not withhold it when the pending question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the point.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas withdraws the point of no quorum. The bill is passed.

On motion of Mr. BARTLETT, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 20562. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 2518. An act granting to the town of Nevadaville, Colo., the right to purchase certain lands for the protection of water supply; and

S. 5629. An act for the relief of certain persons who made entry under the provisions of section 6, act of May 29, 1908.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 7188. An act to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office building at Garden City, Kans.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

S. 7515. An act to reserve lands to the Territory of Alaska for educational uses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

FORTIFICATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] was directed by the Committee on Appropriations to report the fortifications appropriation bill. He was called away unexpectedly, and I present the bill in his behalf.

The bill (H. R. 21491) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes, was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report (No. 1416), ordered to be printed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WHALEY, indefinitely, on account of illness.

HOUR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourn to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourn to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL STATEMENT.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret the necessity which compels me to submit a few remarks upon the subject about which I am about to speak. Two weeks from to-day I retire from the House, and I had hoped that I might retire in peace, with the good will of all of my colleagues here, including all of the gentlemen from Pennsylvania. I do not believe in fighting. I am a Quaker, though I ask no particular consideration at anybody's hands on that account. I hesitate and I dislike to engage in altercation or controversy about personal matters; but for the second time my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR], has seen fit to cast aspersions upon my honor and integrity as a man, as a lawyer, and as a Member of this House. I made no reference to him and his attack upon me was wholly unwarranted and uncalled for. He has declared, and in fact he calls it a charge, that I am the paid attorney of the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railway Co., and that I have been the paid lobbyist before the Legislature of Pennsylvania representing that corporation. As to the insinuation and innuendo contained in that statement, I pronounce it to be absolutely false. As to my employment by the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Co., the facts are simple and are these, as I stated once before upon this floor, and as all of my people in my district know, and as everybody who is interested in Pennsylvania knows: For many years the office with which I am associated has been the local counsel of the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Co. I inherited that client along with others from a very distinguished partner, who had been for many years a Member of this House and who was a judge upon the bench in our State. I represented it in the courts of my county in the usual way, trying damage, personal-injury, and other like cases, and in the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, and nowhere else.

I have not tried a case for the company since I have been in Congress. I have performed no legal service for the company since I have been in Congress. Before I came here I felt it to be perfectly proper for a lawyer to accept a railroad corporation as a client in proper cases. I still think that; and when two weeks from to-day I return to the practice of law I hope that I may have opportunities in proper cases to represent such and all other clients. I make no bones about that; and no honest lawyer has ever held any other position. [Applause.]

The gentleman declares me also to have been the paid lobbyist of that corporation.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. PALMER. Oh, I know what the gentleman said.

Mr. FARR. I yielded to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. I decline to yield. The facts about that are these, that in the legislature of 1907, before I was elected to

Congress, when every railroad corporation in Pennsylvania had been suffering from what is known as "strike legislation"—bills introduced by charlatans and crooks for the purpose of holding up railroad companies—they requested certain attorneys representing them to make legal arguments against these propositions before the committees of the house and senate. I was one of those lawyers. I never asked a member of the legislature to vote for or against any bill. I never interviewed any of them in the senate or the house personally about any bill.

I went before the committees of the legislature and made purely legal arguments upon proposed legislation in an open and public fashion. It was a part of my retainer that I should be permitted to oppose such measures as I believed to be vicious and to support such measures as I believed to be right, and I got in very bad odor with the representatives of railroad companies engaged in that work, because as to the two great pieces of legislation much controverted before that legislature I took a position which every other railroad attorney opposed. The two leading bills were the bill to make a 2-cent fare law in Pennsylvania and an employer's liability law. I stated to the committee that not only would I not oppose the 2-cent law, but that I believed it ought to be enacted into law; and as to the liability law, it was introduced into that legislature by a gentleman who is now a Member of this House, Mr. CASEY, of Pennsylvania, and is known to-day on the statute books as the Casey employers' liability law, and out of all the numerous liability laws that were pending in that legislature I pronounced it to be the best and fairest, and gave it my support before the committee of the legislature. [Applause.] That was the extent of my activities at Harrisburg when retained by the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad Co.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has stated that he went to Harrisburg primarily on a retainer for the railroad company to appear against certain bills.

Mr. PALMER. Such as I might deem bad.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has spoken of two bills which he favored. I judge those were not the bills he was paid a retainer to oppose. Will he not tell us about the bills that he appeared and lobbied against or argued against?

Mr. PALMER. Oh, well, there were a number of them—

Mr. FARR. You bet there were.

Mr. MANN. I would say that was in performance of the retainer. I do not think the other was.

Mr. PALMER. I do not mind saying. For instance, somebody introduced a bill requiring the railroads of Pennsylvania to abolish every grade crossing within the State upon the enactment of the law. I opposed that measure. It would have ruined every railroad company in Pennsylvania as drawn. Another bill, a very common one—

Mr. BLACKMON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. Yes.

Mr. BLACKMON. I want to ask the gentleman a question, and that is if he believes that it is a reflection on a Member of Congress or a member of any other body to represent a railroad?

Mr. PALMER. Well, I think a lawyer has a perfect right—

Mr. BLACKMON. And I want to ask one further question.

Mr. PALMER (continuing). To be retained by a railroad company.

Mr. BLACKMON. I want to ask one further question, and that is if the gentleman ever heard of a man in his life who was always making a fight against a lawyer holding public office and representing a railroad who was not a man with a hickory-nut head?

Mr. PALMER. Well, as far as my observation goes, I think the description is accurate. There were other bills of the same character. Mr. Speaker, as I have said, all of my district has always known that my office has represented that company. It has never sought to influence my political or congressional action in any way, shape, or manner, and it knows me well enough to understand that it dare not do so. [Applause.]

The intimation of the gentleman, the innuendo of the gentleman, is a scandalous abuse of the proprieties of this House. [Applause.] That railroad company runs through my district only about 35 miles; perhaps 40. It has in my district in its employ, I expect, not more than 100 men. Politically it knows that it must keep its hand off PALMER's fights in that district, and the only political connection I ever had with the railroad company or any of its officers—the only time I ever saw any officers go into a political canvass—was when its superintendent became a candidate for office in Lackawanna County—in the

county adjoining mine—upon the same ticket and at the same time the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] was running for Congress, and I went into the district and did everything I could do to lick them both, and I am sorry I did not do it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I would ask for five minutes more.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. PALMER. That is how much the railroad controlled my political action.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want the gentleman from Pennsylvania to have all the time he wants—

Mr. PALMER. I will not take much.

Mr. FARR. But I would like to have a few minutes to reply.

The SPEAKER. Well, is the gentleman objecting or not?

Mr. FARR. No; I do not want to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, this little business will not take long. So much for the political phase of that question. I have found it necessary, as other men have, to go to the Legislature of Pennsylvania to prevent things being done which were wrong. I have done it openly. The Legislature of Pennsylvania has been for many years of such a character that it is necessary for reputable men of the State to go down there and prevent them from abusing their power. Why, the same legislature three or four years ago which killed an up-to-date child-labor law passed a law protecting the tadpoles of Pennsylvania, and the Republican Party has ever since had a keen regard for that class of tadpole statesmen. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And when I went to the Pennsylvania Legislature in open and public hearings to argue the cause of my client or my people I was representing them openly and frankly. I never went there to represent them or any like interest while I was drawing a salary out of the treasury of my State.

And when the Republican machine of Pennsylvania, finding its list of tadpole statesmen getting low, upon one occasion back in 1899, had to have somebody to preside over sessions of the house, it very properly picked my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] as its speaker. Mr. Speaker, that legislature and the succeeding ones were of such a character that the State rose in revolution and, a few years afterwards, despite the enormous Republican majority in the State, turned that party out of power and elected a Democrat to the State treasury, in order that he might put the Republican malefactors, who had been stealing the money of our State, in the penitentiary, where they belonged. My service has been open, public, and honest, Mr. Speaker, in behalf of my people. And I am sorry that I can not say as much for all who have been active in and before the Pennsylvania Legislature.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that kind of an attack on the part of the gentleman has been entirely uncalled for. This matter has been discussed in my district and in my State before, because he has made the charge before. And my people know that I am perfectly willing to let them judge that in my service here, as in my service in Pennsylvania, no corporation anywhere has controlled a single act of mine. But my service has been in behalf of those who are struggling for better conditions in a State where the great interests have denied those conditions. [Applause.]

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 8 or 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FARR. I think, Mr. Speaker, after hearing the defense of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] that it is an admission of every charge that I made. He was in Harrisburg as the paid legal lobbyist of the corporations of Pennsylvania. That is what I said. As regards the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western, the gentleman ought to know how that came on the floor of the House. He was responsible for it. I have not attacked his honor or his integrity or the fact that he had no right to represent a corporation. I have attacked him because of his hypocrisy, his wicked demagoguery, in pretending to be one thing here, when he knows he is another in his own State. Why, Mr. Speaker, when that gentleman assailed the mine officials of the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western in

Luzerne County, he was attacking the officials of the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western who, in his own county were helping to elect him, as I then said.

Mr. PALMER. There are no mine officials in my county.

Mr. FARR. I said the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western officials.

Mr. PALMER. There are no Delaware, Lackawanna & Western officials in the district.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] must not interrupt the other gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] without his consent.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I am amazed at the gall of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER]. Why, Mr. Speaker, he robbed you of two delegates in Luzerne because of his pretenses, his demagoguery, his hypocrisy. They were your delegates. The Democrats of that district were for you. The people of Pennsylvania wanted you. They wanted you in my district, and that gentleman, under the pretense of reform, went all over the great State of Pennsylvania, and in every way possible, honorably and dishonorably—

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I call the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] to order, and the demand that the words be taken down.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] calls the gentleman from Pennsylvania to order and requests that the words be taken down.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to this kind of talk.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is not a matter to be determined by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] as to what he desires in this matter.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend a moment. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] will take his seat until we get through with this business. Now the gentleman from Tennessee will proceed.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I call the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] to order and demand that the words be taken down.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will take them down and report them. What words are they that are excepted to by the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The last two used by the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The shorthand reporter will report them. The rule is:

If a Member is called to order for words spoken in debate, the Member calling him to order shall indicate the words excepted to, and they shall be taken down in writing at the Clerk's desk and read aloud to the House; but he shall not be held to answer nor be subject to the censure of the House therefor, if further debate or other business has intervened.

The Official Reporter will read the words.

The Official Reporter read as follows:

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I am amazed at the gall of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER]. Why, Mr. Speaker, he robbed you of two delegates in Luzerne because of his pretenses, his demagoguery, his hypocrisy. They were your delegates. The people of Pennsylvania wanted you. They wanted you in my district, and that gentleman, under the pretense of reform, went all over the great State of Pennsylvania, and he in every way possible, honorably and dishonorably—

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike those words from the Record.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Which ones?

The SPEAKER. The ones just read.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard for a moment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is recognized.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, both gentlemen, I think, have been out of order. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] has certainly been out of order a dozen times this afternoon and this evening in the language which he used.

They are very quick on that side of the House to make charges against somebody else; very quick to call everybody else names, and then very quick to kick if somebody replies in kind.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] ought not to have used the last word that was used. That is the only word that would be out of order. All the rest were strictly in order—all except the last word. But the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] but a moment ago referred to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR] as "a tadpole statesman." That was strictly out of order. He has referred a dozen times to-day to other people out of order, and gentlemen on the other side have applauded those sentiments; and then they jump at once into the arena if somebody else has used a word out of order.

All debate ought to have been stopped when it began out of order. There has been no time when any of it was in order under the rules of the House, and there have been many words used in the debate which were wholly out of order. I think the gentlemen ought to have had their accession of virtue some time ago on that side of the House, while the debate was proceeding.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it is entirely immaterial to me as to what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] may think as to the proper time for the making of a proper motion. If the gentleman from Illinois regarded the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] as out of order, he of course had his rights under the rules to make the point of order. I agree with the gentleman from Illinois in one thought, and that is that this bitter debate should be ended. I move, Mr. Speaker, to strike from the RECORD the word used by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FARR].

Mr. FARR. Which word?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The word "dishonorably."

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend by striking out the words "or dishonorably."

Mr. BUTLER. There was only one word used to which you could take exception.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend by striking out the words "or dishonorably."

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do not yield to the gentleman for the purpose of offering an amendment. I move to strike out those words read by the Official Reporter from the desk.

The SPEAKER. When the gentleman from Tennessee gets through the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON] to offer an amendment.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. And upon that, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee moves to strike from the RECORD the words read by the Official Reporter, and on that he moves the previous question.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that no quorum is present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I think probably the House will be in a better humor to decide this question in the morning, and it will not be as difficult to get a quorum. As I understand, the question will still be pending when the House meets in the morning if it adjourns now.

The SPEAKER. Yes. The gentleman from Alabama moves that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned, pursuant to the order previously made, until to-morrow, Friday, February 19, 1915, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. Letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law in the French spoliation claims in relation to the vessel sloop *Ruby* (S. Doc. No. 948); to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

2. Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting items of legislation to be incorporated in the general deficiency appropriation bill now pending in the Committee on Appropriations (H. Doc. No. 1610); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Assistant Secretary of Commerce, reporting claim of the Central Railroad of New Jersey for damage to coal dock of said company at Port Liberty, N. J., on account of damages occasioned by collision for which a tender of the Lighthouse Service has been found responsible, which has been considered, adjusted, and determined (H. Doc. No. 1611); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. Letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting lists of papers, documents on the files of Navy Department not needed in the transaction of public business and have no permanent value or historical interest (H. Doc. No. 1612); to

the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting an item of legislation for consideration and inclusion in the general deficiency bill now pending before the Committee on Appropriations (H. Doc. No. 1613); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. LOGUE, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 20243) to acquire a site and erect a building thereon for the use of the United States post office at Wildwood, N. J., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1413), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11299) to enlarge, extend, and make additions to, fireproof, and further improve the post-office building at Shenandoah, Iowa, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1414), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GUDGER, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 18505) to acquire by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise additional land for the Federal building at Manchester, N. H., and to construct an addition thereon, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1415), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CLARK of Florida, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 18402) to provide for the erection of a public building at Long Beach, Cal., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1417), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21377) to encourage the reclamation of certain arid lands in the State of Nevada, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1418), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. STEDMAN: A bill (H. R. 21486) to establish a national military park at the battle field of Guilford Court House; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARTER: A bill (H. R. 21487) providing for the continuance of the Joint Commission to Investigate Indian Affairs; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STOUT: A bill (H. R. 21488) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Havre, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 21489) authorizing the refunding to certain corporations and individuals part of amounts heretofore collected by the United States as a compromise of their delinquency; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 21490) to encourage the reclamation of certain arid lands in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SHERLEY: A bill (H. R. 21491) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. CARAWAY: A bill (H. R. 21492) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of act supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McKELLAR: A bill (H. R. 21493) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 424) providing for the payment of the expenses of an expert and assistant in the fur-seal investigation in Alaska; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOBSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 425) declaring the attitude of the United States toward the open-door policy in China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SINNOTT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 426) providing that the Congress of the United States shall participate in the celebration of the opening of The Dalles-Celilo Canal; to the Committee on Rules.

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, urging the passage of Senate bill 5042, entitled "A bill legalizing certain conveyances heretofore made by the Central Pacific Railroad Co. and others within the State of Nevada"; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also (by request), memorial of the second Legislature of the State of Arizona, for Congress to provide for the restoration and preservation of the ancient historic Spanish mission San Jose de Comacacori on the bank of the Santa Cruz River, in Santa Cruz County, Ariz.; to the Committee on the Library.

Also (by request), memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, asking that Congress provide for and maintain a Government fish hatchery in the State of Arizona to stock the streams with food fishes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HAYES: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, urging the passage of the Keating bill, relative to placing veterans of the United States Army who fought in Indian wars from 1865 to 1891 on the pension roll; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BOOHER: Memorial of the State Legislature of Nevada, favoring the passage of Senate bill 5042; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Memorial of the Legislature of Oregon, urging Congress to authorize the Department of Agriculture to devise ways and means of destroying wild predatory animals in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KETTNER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, urging the passage of the Keating bill relative to placing veterans of the United States Army who fought in Indian wars from 1865 to 1891 on the pension roll; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SINNOTT: Memorial of the Oregon Legislature, favoring rural credits; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of Oregon Legislature, favoring an appropriation of \$300,000 for suppression of predatory wild animals; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Oregon Legislature, favoring pensions for veterans of Modoc Indian wars of 1872 and 1873 and Indian wars of 1878; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of Oregon Legislature, concerning national navigation laws; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of Oregon Legislature, concerning reorganization of national militia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Oregon Legislature, concerning the building of roads; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Oregon Legislature, concerning patenting of Carey Act segregations; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of Oregon Legislature, relative to rabies-infected coyotes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 21494) granting a pension to Martha Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARR: A bill (H. R. 21495) granting a pension to Catharine Cocain; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 21496) for the relief of Dr. E. V. Hallman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 21497) for the relief of the heirs of James Cloud, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 21498) granting an increase of pension to Levi Jackson Richardson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 21499) granting a pension to James Chaffin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21500) granting an increase of pension to George Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21501) granting an increase of pension to James F. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21502) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Combs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21503) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Dyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21504) for the relief of Henry C. Adams and others; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 21505) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Sloan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: A bill (H. R. 21506) for the relief of George Gillette; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VOLLMER: A bill (H. R. 21507) granting an increase of pension to Alfred R. Long; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Memorial of citizens of Valley Park, Mo., and American Neutrality League, favoring embargo on war materials; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of Chamber of Commerce of the United States, urging reconsideration of the Deitrick amendment to the Army appropriation bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of various citizens of Warrenton, Mo., protesting against bill to amend the postal laws; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Evidence to accompany House bill 21467, for the relief of Silenus A. Simons; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, evidence to accompany House bill 21466, for the relief of Ellen Curtin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of German Beneficial Union, of Columbus, Ohio, favoring bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY: Petition of Gustav Betterman, of Johnstown, Pa., favoring bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRODBECK: Petition of bakers of the twentieth congressional district of Pennsylvania, favoring an embargo on wheat; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of 31 bakers and grocers of York and Hanover, Pa., to prevent exportation of grain and foodstuffs, and request investigation as to cause of advance in price of grain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRYAN: Petition of citizens of Tacoma, Wash., favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Petition of Charles W. Stauss and 42 other citizens of Glenbeulah, Sheboygan County, Wis., asking for the passage at this session of H. J. Res. 377, to levy an embargo on all contraband of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions adopted by the American Neutrality League of Wisconsin at a mass meeting held at Milwaukee on February 11, 1915, asking for the passage of a law authorizing the President of the United States to levy an embargo on the exportation of arms and munitions to any of the belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER: Petition of William Lindner and other residents of Kenosha, Wis., asking that legislation be enacted to place an embargo on the shipment of arms, etc., to the belligerent nations of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of E. K. Dupont and other citizens of Stockton, Cal., favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CURRY: Petitions of citizens of Benicia, Martinez, Stockton, Lodi, Elk Grove, and Galt, all in the State of California, favoring House bill 5308, to tax mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 92 citizens of Stockton, Cal., favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DALE: Memorial of the board of directors of the Associated Employers of Indianapolis, in support of the militia pay bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of New York Stereotypers' Union, No. 1, protesting against President vetoing the immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: Petitions of the Catholic Church at Pawhuska, Okla., and Knights of Columbus, Council No. 952, of

Muskogee, Okla., favoring House bill 20644, to prohibit certain publications from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial of the Associated Employers of Indianapolis, in support of the militia pay bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Sauk County (Wis.) Country Life Association, favoring present method of rural free delivery; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petition of Carpenters' Union No. 82, of Haverhill, Mass., relative to unemployment in the United States; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of St. James Council, No. 298, Knights of Columbus, relative to persecution of Catholics in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAY: Petition of citizens of Virginia, protesting against passage of H. R. 20644; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HINEBAUGH: Petition of William E. Cadmus, of Chicago, Ill., protesting against tone of recent notes from the State Department to English and German foreign offices; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JACOWAY: Protest of citizens of Perryville, Ark., against Fitzgerald amendment to Post Office appropriation bill relative to freedom of press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Coraopolis, Pa., protesting against bill to amend the postal law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Connecticut: Petition from the members of the Lutheran St. Paul's Church, Beethoven Lodge, German-American Alliance, Torrington Lodge No. 462, D. O. H., all of Torrington, Conn., to prohibit the sale and export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of John H. Rosenbeck and 60 others, of Torrington, Conn., favoring bills to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS of Maryland: Petition of Rev. L. D. Zimmerman and others, of Accident, Md., favoring an embargo on war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petitions of St. Joseph German Society, Bristol, and Deutscher Radfahrer Club Eichenlaub, of New Britain, Conn., protesting against export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petition of citizens of Nebraska, favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURDOCK: Petition of Socialist Party of Wichita, Kans., favoring legislation to meet the problem of the unemployed; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. RAKER: Memorial of board of directors, Associated Employers of Indianapolis, in support of militia pay bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Petition of Mrs. M. J. Schroeder, 717 York Street, St. Paul, Minn., favoring exclusion of certain periodicals from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Harmonia Lodge, O. D. H. S., of Meriden, Conn., favoring embargo on arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of New Jersey Turn Bezirk, of Hoboken, N. J., relative to the neutrality of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of A. L. Ortman and Monmouth County Federation of Patriotic and Religious Fraternities, against the Fitzgerald amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Petitions of Chris Harrigfield and others, citizens of Squirrel; E. M. Frank and others, of American Falls; Theodore Goers and others, all of Idaho, protesting against export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of Rev. W. M. Care and 17 citizens of Caldwell, and Rev. J. S. Colvin and 44 citizens of Hampa, all in the State of Idaho, protesting against employment of child labor; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma: Petition of members of St. Joseph's Catholic Church, Norman, Okla., and of St. Joseph's Cathedral, Oklahoma City, Okla., relative to circulation of certain publications through the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. VOLLMER: Petition of mass meeting of Bellevue, Iowa, against polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, February 19, 1915.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. George H. Williams, of Virginia, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, we thank Thee that under such auspicious circumstances we are again permitted to meet in this place. We pray Thy presence and blessing upon us and upon the deliberations of this august body. We pray that Thy holy Spirit may lead us in the way of Thy commandments, and that Thou wilt help us to do Thy will and to serve Thee in our day and generation. Forgive us all our sins, guide us by Thy holy Spirit through the remainder of our life, and after this life receive us into the eternal life. We ask it for the sake of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. Amen.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gronna	Myers	Smith, Ga.
Bryan	Hitchcock	Nelson	Smoot
Burleigh	Hollis	Oliver	Sterling
Camden	Hughes	Overman	Stone
Catron	Johnson	Owen	Swanson
Chamberlain	Jones	Page	Thomas
Clapp	Kenyon	Perkins	Townsend
Clark, Wyo.	Kern	Pittman	Warren
Crawford	La Follette	Poindexter	Weeks
Culberson	Lane	Robinson	White
Dillingham	Lea, Tenn.	Root	Works
Fall	Lodge	Sheppard	
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Simmons	
Gallinger	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ariz.	

Mr. KERN. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. THORNTON] on account of illness. This announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-three Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The Secretary will read the Journal of the proceedings of the preceding session.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. OLIVER, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If it can be disposed of without trouble now, the Chair would like to call attention to the fact that the Journal of January 29 has never been approved.

Mr. SMOOT. I will state that I have that matter now on my desk, and I think it will be but a day or two before it can be finally decided. I realize the importance of disposing of it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not want just now to start anything.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 21161) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 21161. An act making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and, on motion of Mr. SHIVELY, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

CREDENTIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented the credentials of ELLISON D. SMITH, chosen by the electors of the State of South Carolina a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1915, which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of South Dakota, urging Congress to use all honorable and lawful means to compel the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway Co. to construct a new bridge across the Missouri River at Chamberlain, S. Dak., which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Associated Employers of Indianapolis, Ind., praying for the passage of the so-called